

**2E/2T ACQUISITION PROCUREMENT/PRODUCTION
PROCESS ACTION TEAM (PAT)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 1-990 **REQ COMPLETION DATE:** CLOSED

ISSUE/PROBLEM: Illegible PP2s. The Services are providing typed PP2s using Marine Corps software, but the SMCA data are handwritten. No common software for PP2s.

STATUS: OPEN: MONITOR: **CLOSED:** XXX

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: JOHN WILDRIDGE

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

9/90 AMCCOM - Investigate the use of Marine Corps software or typing PP2s before returning the PP2s back to the Services.

9/90 NAVAIR - Contact EDCA for establishing common software.

1/91 NAVAIR - Provide progress of Joint Service Ad Hoc Working Group on PP2 Review.

3/91 NAVAIR - Action of January 1991 still open. JOCG Ad Hoc Working Group on PP2 is scheduled to meet in April 1991 after the JOCG Acquisition Subgroup meeting.

6/91 NWSC Crane - Provide status of July JOCG/Acquisition Subgroup meeting on automating and submitting PP2s.

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

9/90 NAVAIR - Contacted EDCA (CDR Bacon). Two approaches to solving the problem: 1) Develop bridge software to link the PP2 and pricing processes inside AMCCOM so the pricing/production analysts can enter data fields into the PP2s, ICAPP, and Pricing data base at the same time; 2) Develop the CAPE module of DSACs which are unlikely.

10/90 NAVAIR - Take issue to JOCG Acquisition Subgroup meeting 14-15 November 1990 for resolution. EDCA has action to resolve variations.

1/91 NAVAIR - JOCG Acquisition Subgroup established Ad Hoc Working Group to review and change, if necessary, the entire PP2 form. Representation by all Services. Additional monitoring of the DSAC's CAPE module from Action Item Number 9-1090 will be included in this Action Item.

6/91 MCLN0 - (Randy Murdock) Provided the status of the Marine Corps attempt to use the new automated PP2 submission process. PP2 legible common software package is needed to supply AMCCOM with information. AMCCOM needs to modify software to accept information. (This included using DSACs (CAPE Module). For

ACTION #1-990 (CONTINUED)

the May 1991 submission of Marine Corps PP2s, CAPE accepted the automated data, but internal AMCCOM PD and PC had problems using the automated data. The Marine Corps did not load directly onto CAPE, nor would they in the future, since CAPE was not user-friendly. The disc was provided to AMCCOM, which loaded CAPE with no problems. The August 1991 submission for the other Services will probably not be able to use the automated form yet.

The Services will need to make a more detailed decision in the July 1991 JOCG meeting.

8/91 NWSC Crane - PP2s are now more legible. Common software package is needed to supply AMCCOM with automated pricing information.

10/91 NWSC Crane - PP2 format finalized at JOCG meeting of 17-18 September 1991. Revised PP2 format will be included in updated Chapter 6 of DOD 5160.65M. Working group meeting to be held at AMCCOM on 5 November 1991 to review preparation process.

All services to electronically transmit PP2s in December/January submission. Action closed.

**2E/2T ACQUISITION PROCUREMENT/PRODUCTION
PROCESS ACTION TEAM (PAT)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 2-990 **REQ COMPLETION DATE:** AUG 91

ISSUE/PROBLEM: Standard fixed price is locked before Army breakout meeting and NAVSEA planning meeting.

STATUS: OPEN: MONITOR: **CLOSED:** XXX

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: JOHN WILDRIDGE

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

Narrative: Army Make or Buy Meeting and the NAVSEA Planning Meetings are held October/November (1990) after pricing is locked in July for the next budget year (1992). Procurement strategy and CFM should be identified on May PP2s (e.g., April 1991 for FY-93 budget).

10/90 NAVAIR - Recommend AIR/AIR CFAs by invited to NAVSEA planning meeting (Fall 1990) if feasible.

10/90 NWSC Crane (5025) - Distribute NAVSEA planning documents (CIPPs) to AIR/AMCCOM for review/comment.

10/90 AMCCOM (QAM-I) - Investigate having joint SEA/AIR/AMCCOM planning meeting to be held in April 1991 for FY-93 buys.

1/91 NAVAIR (2E)/NWSC Crane (2T) (5025) - To measure the impact of the joint 2E/2T technical planning meeting, compare the June 1991 "Fixed Standard Price" versus the P-22A pricing data provided back from the SMCA with the PP2 forms.

3/91 NAVAIR/NWSC Crane (5025) - Actions of January 1991 still open.

6/91 NWSC Crane (5025)/SPCC/PMTC (2041) - Write procedure for identifying, reserving, and accounting for Navy GFM Components to support production.

1/91 AMCCOM/NAVAIR/NWSC Crane - A joint 2E/2T technical planning meeting was established in early April 1991 at AMCCOM to review FY-93 procurements in advance of locking fixed standard prices. The meeting will be co-chaired by NWSCC (John Wildridge) and NAVAIR (Anne Leonard).

6/91 NWSC Crane (5025 AND PM4A) - Reviewed the outcome of the April 1991 (2T) Planning Meeting at AMCCOM. Proper preparation of GFM components was not done by either the Navy or AMCCOM. NWSCC (5025) is trying to establish a tracking system for 2T components, but it is in its early stages yet.

8/91 NWSC Crane (502) - Tracking system has been developed to

ACTION #2-990 (CONTINUED)

track components used in 2T ammunition. The system is currently being tested using fuze data.

**2E/2T ACQUISITION PROCUREMENT/PRODUCTION
PROCESS ACTION TEAM (PAT)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 3-990

REQ COMPLETION DATE:

ISSUE/PROBLEM: Program Offices are submitting PP2s when material is available through excess. Program Offices do not get excess lists from other Services.

STATUS: OPEN:

MONITOR:

CLOSED: XXX

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: TOM GREEN
BRAD SITZ
ANNE LEONARD
J. D. LYNCH
GERI DUGAN

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

9/90 SPCC AND AMCCOM (DS) - Assure program offices (NAVAIR PMA-201/253; NWSC Crane PM4) receive excess lists from all Services.

9/90 - Program Offices will not submit PP2s when excess is available.

1/91 NWSC Crane AND NAVAIR - After the April 1991 technical planning meeting, in Action #2-990, identify the items (DODIC, nomenclature, quantity, estimated cost and FY) that were gotten from or proposed to be gotten from another Service's Excess list without spending funds to buy them. Collect this data on an annual basis.

1/91 SPCC - Action of 9/90 still open.

3/91 SPCC - Assure other Services are getting Navy Excess List.

3/91 AMCCOM (DSD-PC) - Assure NAVAIR (PMA-201/253) and NWSC Crane (PM4) are sent a current copy of Army Excess List by 15 March. Also put same codes on distribution for further lists.

3/91 AMCCOM (DSD-PC) - Brief the excess process within AMCCOM (DS & PD) at the April Planning Meeting. Intent is to assure all excess material is considered prior to procurements whether they are AURs or components.

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

1/91 AMCCOM - NAVAIR (PMA-201) has been put on distribution for the CAWCF Excess List. (Issued quarterly). NWSCC (PM4 AND Code 5025) are already on distribution per AMCCOM (PD) Barbara Vanhuizan (AV 793-4698).

- Army In Stock Excess List is being provided to

ACTION #3-990 (CONTINUED)

SPCC per AMCCOM (DSD) Judy Janson (AV 793-4698).

3/91 SPCC - Marine Corps and Air Force do not have defined excess lists. Army and Navy excess lists are being sent out but neither NWSC Crane (PM4) or NAVAIR (PMA-201B3) have received them.

4/91 - Excess lists provided by AMCCOM at planning meeting.
Brief also provided - Action Closed.

**2E/2T ACQUISITION PROCUREMENT/PRODUCTION
PROCESS ACTION TEAM (PAT)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 4-990 **REQ COMPLETION DATE:** ONGOING

ISSUE/PROBLEM: MIPR clause information is sometimes not on PRONs and does not get onto the solicitation.

STATUS: OPEN: MONITOR: **CLOSED:** XXX

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: TOM GREEN
BRAD SITZ

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

Narrative: The problem exists because solicitations are prepared based on PP2s and planning PRONs. No MIPR information is available. When MIPRs or even Planning MIPRs arrive, the additional information is not incorporated.

10/90 SPCC - Provide appropriate clauses identified to the DODIC for proper distribution of documents (November 1990 for 1992 buy).

10/90 AMCCOM (PD/PP/PC) - Assure MIPR clause information gets into all PRONs.

1/91 SPCC - Provide "MIPR Standard Clause" for the FY-92 buy to AMCCOM by 31 March 1991, similar to SPCC letter 4410 Ser 852X/5806 of 20 December 1990 on FY-91 buys.

1/91 NWSC Crane (5025)/NAVAIR - Select 15 (2E) and 15 (2T) FY-91 items, and compare Navy MIPR Clause Requirements versus what is actually being given to the producer. Provide at next meeting.

3/91 NWSC Crane (5025)/SPCC/NAVAIR - All actions of January 1991 remain open.

3/91 AMCCOM (PCA-WW) - Review AMCCOM distribution of Solicitations. Assure the proper Navy technical agents are put on distribution (for Navy-developed items only).

3/91 ALL ISEA/CFAs - Implement PAT Number 2 Standard PDP format for the FY-93 procurements.

4/91 AMCCOM (PCA-WW)/NWSC Crane (5025)/NAVAIR/ISEA CFAs - All actions of March 1991 remain open.

4/91 SPCC - Provide a review of the AMCCOM-recommended changes to MIPR Standard Clause for the FY-93 procurements. Supporting data/rationale for the changes should also be provided.

4/91 NWSC Crane (PM4) - Coordinate with PAT Number 2 to assure they are aware PAT Number 3 is still responsible for the content of MIPR Clauses.

6/91 SPCC - Action of April 1991 remains open. AMCCOM had not

ACTION #4-990 (CONTINUED)

provided its review of the Standard Clause yet.

6/91 NWSC Crane (5025)/PMTC (2041) - Select 15 (2T) and 15 (2E) FY-91 items, and compare Navy MIPR clause requirements with what is actually being given to the producer.

6/91 PMTC (2041) - Provide to all PAT Number 3 members the published PAT Number 2 PDP format.

**2E/2T ACQUISITION PROCUREMENT/PRODUCTION
PROCESS ACTION TEAM (PAT)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 5-990

REQ COMPLETION DATE:

ISSUE/PROBLEM: Providing copies of standard clauses with each basic MIPR.

STATUS: OPEN:

MONITOR:

CLOSED: XXX

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: TOM GREEN

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

10/90 SPCC - Provide master set of standard clauses that will be referenced in the MIPR.

10/90 AMCCOM (DS and PC) - Review standard clauses and propose policy for approval.

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

10/90 - CDR Peck (NVLNO) is investigating the best of three possible alternatives:

- (1) Send clauses by letter to AMCCOM (PD) to distribute to all appropriate staff.
- (2) Put the clauses into PP2s which may require JOCG Acquisition Subgroup action to change PP2 format.
- (3) Submit clauses on planning MIPRs in March before they are funded.

Alternative (2) appears to be the best long term solution with alternative (1) used for the short term.

1/19 - Closed, combined with action item #4-990.

**2E/2T ACQUISITION PROCUREMENT/PRODUCTION
PROCESS ACTION TEAM (PAT)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 6-990 **REQ COMPLETION DATE:**

ISSUE/PROBLEM: Contract delay due to processing of acquisition plan.

STATUS: **OPEN:** **MONITOR:** **CLOSED:** XXX

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: BILL BANKS
 BRAD SITZ

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

Narrative: The purpose of the internal acquisition plan developed by AMCCOM (PC) was questioned. How does this plan relate to the CAWCF budget and ICAPP? How does it relate to the J&A.

9/90 AMCCOM - Will research.

1/91 AMCCOM (QAM-I) - Will research status of (JS) action and explain the Internal Acquisition Plan at the next meeting.

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

3/91 AMCCOM (PCA-WW) - Brief discussion provided by David Schwegler. Formal Acquisition plans are only on selected items requested by the Department of the Army. Typically 3 - 5 large procurements per year, none of which are 2T/2E.

4/91 AMCCOM (QAM-I) - Provided additional discussion paper on this issue.

**2E/2T ACQUISITION PROCUREMENT/PRODUCTION
PROCESS ACTION TEAM (PAT)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 7-990 **REQ COMPLETION DATE:** CLOSED

ISSUE/PROBLEM: Navy is not always notified when there is a pre-award survey on Navy-developed items. In addition, Navy is not consulted on the decision to perform a pre-award.

STATUS: OPEN: MONITOR: **CLOSED:** XXX

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: SARA BROWN

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

10/90 AMCCOM - Investigate how to get policy/procedure in place to contact Navy ISEA/CFA for inputs to pre-award decision and attend surveys.

1/91 NWSC Crane - Prepare response to AMCCOM letter AMSMC-PD 715 (B) of 20 December 1990. Provide with Navy ISEA/CFA points of contact for pre-awards. Close action, since this will be monitored in Action item #21-1090.

6/91 NWSC Crane (PM4) - Write letter to AMCCOM (PC) requesting clarification on who will coordinate pre-awards on Navy items. Per AMCCOM (PD) letter 715 (B) of 20 December 1990, the coordination role is no longer PDA-S.

8/91 AMCCOM - Define the process for determining whether a pre-award is required and the process to notify the Navy of a pre-award.

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

1/91 AMCCOM - AMSMC-PD letter 715 (B) of 20 December 1990:

"Effective with FY-91 procurement actions, AMCCOM, AMSMC-PDA-S, will coordinate with the Navy in-service engineering agency/configuration manager for input to need for performance of a pre-award evaluation effort. AMSMC-PDA-S requests that points of contact and agencies involved be provided for the Navy. Once the need for a pre-award survey is established, AMSMC-PCA(R) will advise the Inservice Engineering Agency/CFA by datafax from the Navy Liaison Office."

3/91 NWSC Crane - Issued letter 8000 Ser PM4A/5025 of 27 February 1991 to provide ISEA/CFA points of contact. Action closed.

6/91 AMCCOM (PCA-WW) - AMSMC-PDA-S coordination role for pre-awards was never identified in PDA-S, but that responsibility has now been moved to PCM. PDA-S does not exist anymore.

ACTION #7-990 (CONTINUED)

8/91 AMCCOM - Team will monitor AMSMC-PC response to 23 August 91 memo requesting Naval Technical Representation at pre-award surveys. AMCCOM will identify process for Navy pre-award surveys.

10/91 AMCCOM - Pre-award process as follows: (1) bids are received; (2) contract specialist (CS) reviews; (3) PIL 9-4-91 implemented (PARA 3C); (4) guidelines of FAR 9.106 applied; (5) determination based on knowledge of current contracts and contractor's history, and recommendation/request of other organizations (PD/ENGR/DCAS); (6) final decision by PCO whether to have a pre-award survey; (7) engineers/production notified by contract specialist pre-award survey will be performed. Action closed.

**2E/2T ACQUISITION PROCUREMENT/PRODUCTION
PROCESS ACTION TEAM (PAT)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 8-1090

REQ COMPLETION DATE:

ISSUE/PROBLEM: Need for understanding Procurement Early Development (PED) system currently operating at SPCC.

STATUS: OPEN:

MONITOR:

CLOSED: XXX

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: TOM GREEN

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

10/90 SPCC - Brief PAT #3 at the next meeting on PED.

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

1/91 SPCC/FMSO - Brief by LT Steve Gallant (FMSO). PED applies primarily to stock numbered non-ordnance items for spare parts. This system will be used by all Services. Code 852X is participating for potential future use at SPCC on procurement of ordnance item.

- FMSO AND AMCCOM (DSACs) representatives will be meeting to assure future interface of the two systems.

**2E/2T ACQUISITION PROCUREMENT/PRODUCTION
PROCESS ACTION TEAM (PAT)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 9-1090

REQ COMPLETION DATE:

ISSUE/PROBLEM: Need to understand current status of Army's DSACs computer module related to Acquisition.

STATUS: OPEN:

MONITOR:

CLOSED: XXX

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: TOM GREEN

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

SPCC - Coordinate with AMCCOM to have them brief PAT #3 at the next meeting on the Current Status of the DSACs module as it relates to acquisition.

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

1/91 SPCC/AMCCOM - Brief by Keith Thess (AMCCOM) (SC). CAPE module (Phase I), allowing automation of PP2 submissions, should be operational for test on Marine Corps data by 31 March 1991. A manual submit of PP2 will still be required in May 1991. The automation does not include P24, P22A and P21 data but may be possible in the near future using Marine Corps software.

1/91 - Issue closed. Any additional effort will be consolidated into action #1-990.

**2E/2T ACQUISITION PROCUREMENT/PRODUCTION
PROCESS ACTION TEAM (PAT)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 10-1090 **REQ COMPLETION DATE:**

ISSUE/PROBLEM: Need to coordinate with PAT #2 on common interests (PAT #2 action items 7-690, 8-690 and 13-890).

STATUS: OPEN: MONITOR: **CLOSED:** XXX

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: ANNE LEONARD

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

NAVAIR - Coordinate with PAT #2 to organize a brief on the following action items from PAT #2: (7-690, 8-690 and 13-890) 10/90 - Briefing should be provided at the next PAT #3 meeting in January of 1991.

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

1/91 NAVAIR - PAT #2 Chairman (Ron Rosenthal) (PMA-201A) brief on PAT #2 actions 7-690, 8-690 and 13-690. Also reviewed PAT #2 performance measurement indicators.

**2E/2T ACQUISITION PROCUREMENT/PRODUCTION
PROCESS ACTION TEAM (PAT)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 11-1090 **REQ COMPLETION DATE:**

ISSUE/PROBLEM: Need to assure PAT #2 and PAT #3 are aware of common areas of interest addressed at individual meetings.

STATUS: OPEN: MONITOR: **CLOSED:** XXX

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: J. D. LYNCH
 ANNE LEONARD

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

10/90 NWSC Crane - Assure PAT #2 chairman is on distribution for a complete set of all future PAT #3 minutes.

10/90 NAVAIR - Assure PAT #3 chairman is on distribution for a complete set of all future PAT #2 minutes.

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

1/91 NWSC Crane AND NAVAIR - PAT #2 and PAT #3 chairmen on distribution for complete set of minutes.

**2E/2T ACQUISITION PROCUREMENT/PRODUCTION
PROCESS ACTION TEAM (PAT)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 12-1090

REQ COMPLETION DATE:

ISSUE/PROBLEM: A limit of 45 days turn around was set for First Article Test (FAT) completion with another limit of 30 days on Lot Acceptance Test (LAT). This appears to be arbitrary and in some cases detrimental to its assumed goal.

STATUS: OPEN: MONITOR: **CLOSED:** XXX

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: BRAD SITZ
 ANNE LEONARD
 JOHN WILDRIDGE

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

10/90 AMCCOM - Investigate why there is a 45 day limit on FAT and 30 days on LAT completion. Where is it defined? Is this necessary and can/should it be adjusted?

1/91 AMCCOM - Amend Chapter 5 of DOD Manual 5160.65M to allow LAT and FAT exceptions to 30 and 45 day time limits.

1/91 NAVAIR AND NWSC Crane - After the April 1991 technical Planning Meeting, defined in action 2-990, identify if any LAT or FAT day limit changes have been made.

3/91 AMCCOM, NAVAIR, NWSC Crane - Both actions from 1/91 still open.

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

1/91 AMCCOM - Point Paper and Discussion - The 45 and 30 day time requirements are not defined but have become standardized within AMCCOM. The Product Quality Manager can change the times but it must be reasonable per the Federal Acquisition Regulation. Three groups of Navy items; fuzes, decoy flares and marine location markers historically have missed the time limits. Upon written guidance to QAM from the Navy they can change the limits.

1/91 ALL ISEAs/CFAs - The day limits for LAT and FAT completion will be provided to AMCCOM by the ISEA/CFA as a part of the quality assurance requirements and in the CIPPs. There can be exceptions to the 30 and 45 day limits if necessary.

6/91 NWSC Crane (5025) (2T) - No changes were made to the LAT or FAT limits as a result of the April 1991 planning meeting.
Action closed.

**2E/2T ACQUISITION PROCUREMENT/PRODUCTION
PROCESS ACTION TEAM (PAT)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 13-1090

REQ COMPLETION DATE:

ISSUE/PROBLEM: AMCCOM (QAM-I) is no longer a participant at pre-award surveys on Navy developed items. They are the Navy's primary quality focal point within AMCCOM.

STATUS: OPEN: MONITOR: **CLOSED:** XXX

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: BRAD SITZ

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

AMCCOM - Investigate why QAM-I is no longer a participant at the pre-award surveys on Navy developed items. As the Navy's primary quality focal point within AMCCOM their participation would also assure Navy technical activity participation/invitation at pre-awards.

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

1/91 AMCCOM - Point Paper/Discussion - In FY-89, a decision was made that due to budgetary constraints Product Quality Managers would no longer be authorized TDY for participation in Pre-Award Surveys. It is the position of AMCCOM's Product Assurance & Test Directorate that this function has been delegated to the Contract Administrative Service (CAS). DCAS is in the best position to evaluate the performance capability of a potential contractor. The Director's position is the PQM participation in a Pre-Award Survey requires a special request from the cognizant Procurement Directorate Division Chief. The Navy's desire to have greater AMSMC-QAM participation in Pre-Awards can be addressed to AMSMC-QA for evaluation and comment.

1/91 ISEA/CFAs - If Navy wants QAM to participate in pre-awards, they can request their participation through the AMSMC-QA director.

1/91 - Closed based on action 7-990 addressing pre-awards.

**2E/2T ACQUISITION PROCUREMENT/PRODUCTION
PROCESS ACTION TEAM (PAT)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 14-1090 **REQ COMPLETION DATE:**

ISSUE/PROBLEM: Performance measurement: Technical Data Packages are not being sent to AMCCOM and SPCC on time (1 April 90 for FY 91 Procurement).

STATUS: OPEN: MONITOR: **CLOSED:** XXX

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: JOHN WILDRIDGE
JOE BOKSER

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

10/90 NWSC Crane (FOR 2T) AND NOS IH (FOR 2E) - For FY-91 Procurement, collect data to illustrate the number of Technical Data Packages sent to AMCCOM and SPCC on time Vs. the number required (by 1 April 1990 for the FY-91 buys).

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

1/91 NWSC Crane (Code 5025) - Provided charts on 2T for 89 through 91 buys. Historically 75-85% of TDPs are delivered by 1 April with 98% by 1 June. Late TDPs are not a problem. Even 1 June is ample time to prepare solicitations and etc., prior to 1 October.

1/91 NOS IH - Late TDPs are also not a problem for 2E. The adequacy of TDPs is being addressed by PAT #2.

1/91 - Closed since PAT #2 is currently collecting similar TDP data as a performance indicator.

**2E/2T ACQUISITION PROCUREMENT/PRODUCTION
PROCESS ACTION TEAM (PAT)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 15-1090 **REQ COMPLETION DATE:** NEXT MTG

STATUS: OPEN: MONITOR: **CLOSED:** XXX

ISSUE/PROBLEM: Performance measurement: Timeliness of
Procurement funding being sent to AMCCOM or SPCC.

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: TOM GREEN

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

10/90 SPCC - Provide the following data on a monthly basis for
FY-90 & 91 procurement:

Number of MIPRs/PO

Dollar value of each MIPR/PO

When funds arrived and were accepted by AMCCOM and SPCC.

1/91 SPCC - Above action of 10/90 remains open, but data is to be
collected as defined in action #17-1090 in January 1991. Data
elements pertinent to this performance indicator should be
summarized prior to the next meeting.

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

3/91 SPCC - Provided FY-91 data to illustrate when 2T and 2E
funds were received by SPCC, MIPRs were sent to AMCCOM and SMCA
accepted the MIPR (448-2 issued). For 2T more detailed analysis
was done to show; the average number of days from 1 October
(start of FY) until SPCC received the funds (79 days); average
number of days for SPCC to issue MIPR to AMCCOM (18 days); and
the average number of days for SMCA to accept MIPR (9 days).

3/91 - This action was closed combined with action 17-1090 since
the data elements are being collected under 17-1090.

**2E/2T ACQUISITION PROCUREMENT/PRODUCTION
PROCESS ACTION TEAM (PAT)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 16-1090 **REQ COMPLETION DATE:** 15 FEB 91

ISSUE/PROBLEM: Performance measurement: Turn around time for processing Waivers and Deviations.

STATUS: OPEN: MONITOR: **CLOSED:** XXX

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: TOM GREEN
 BRAD SITZ

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

10/90 AMCCOM (SMCA PROCURED 2T/2E ITEMS) AND SPCC (ALL OTHER 2T/2E ITEMS) - For FY-88 through FY-90, provide data illustrating the turn around time from initiation of a request for Waiver/Deviation to the response back to the AMCCOM PCO and then the PCO to the contractor. Also identify the number of requests for Waivers/Deviations and recurring requests by FY and Cog.
1/91 AMCCOM - Provide summarized response to the above 10/90 action by 15 February 1991.
3/91 AMCCOM - Action from 1/91 still open.

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

1/91 SPCC - Data illustrated an average of 19 day turnaround time from initial request for Waiver/Deviation to official mod of the contract. This is not a problem on SPCC procured items.
1/91 AMCCOM - Raw data illustrated an average of 28 days to process initial waivers/deviations back and forth between AMCCOM and Navy technical activities. This is not causing any delays on Navy contracts. There does appear to be an additional delay of sometimes 30 days or more in AMCCOM officially moding the contract, but the contractor normally gets formal direction from the PCO earlier. There are seven Navy items which were noted as appearing to have more than their share of reoccurring deviation. These are the KMU 466 Bomb Fuze, Zuni Rocket, Mk 14 Bomb Suspension Lugs, Mk 43 Reserve Energizer, Mk 84 GP Bomb, MJU-8 Decoy Flare and the Mk 72/73 Bomb Cables.
4/91 - Issue closed, no additional data required as this does not appear to be a significant problem.

**2T/2E ACQUISITION STANDING WORKING GROUP
(SWG)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 17-1090

REQ COMPLETION DATE:

ISSUE/PROBLEM: Performance Measurement - Adhering to the "Administrative Lead Time" and "Production Lead Time" defined on the PP2s.

STATUS: **OPEN:** **MONITOR:** **CLOSED:** XXX

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: ROSETTA WHITE

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

10/90 AMCCOM (SMCA-Procured 2E/2T Items)/SPCC (all other 2E/2T Items) - For FY-88 through FY-91 procurements, provide the following data:

FY	COG	DODIC	\$ VALUE	ADMIN TIME	MONTH OF CONTRACT AWARD	MONTH OF FIRST DELIVERY	INDENT IF 1ST ARTICLE OR NOT
----	-----	-------	-------------	---------------	-------------------------------	-------------------------------	------------------------------------

1/91 SPCC (all 2E/2T items) - Consolidate and provide the following data for routine access by PAT Number 3 (elements noted with an asterisk (*) requested in 1/91 AMCCOM (QAM-I) action):

COG	* Procurement Doc Ident. No./MIPR No.
* DODIC	Date MIPR forwarded to AMCCOM
* NIIN	Date MIPR is accepted by AMCCOM
Procurement Authority	Purchase Request Number (PR)
K No.	
Cost Code	Date PR forwarded to Contracting Officer
Date PM signed Procurement Authorization	* SMCA Contract Number
Date SPCC Receive PA	* Contractor Name
QQuantity to Procure	Date SMCA awards contract
Total Funds Authorized	Date material is accepted
Unit Price	Date delivered material is received by depot

Date material delivered (shows up

in inventory)

* Published Admin and Production Lead Times

Assure that headings on the columns of data provided are self-explanatory. Assure data-sort capability for future use and/or

ACTION #17-1090 (CONTINUED)

additions to this data base by PAT Number 3.

1/91 SPCC - Summarize pertinent data elements from above data to specifically address this action/issue statement (Number 17-1090).

1/91 AMCCOM (QAM-I) - Provide to SPCC the data elements noted with an asterisk (*) in the above January 1991 action for SPCC.
3/91 SPCC - Continue to provide data elements requested in first SPCC action of January 1991, except "unit price" element (which was deemed unnecessary). In addition, add the element "Date PM Received Funds."

3/91 NAVAIR (2E Cog)/NWSCC (2T Cog) - Provide SPCC the date PM received funds by the LOA or allotment as appropriate.

3/91 AMCCOM (DSD-PC) - Add the data elements "contract award date," "contract number," and "contractor name" to future Form 38s.

3/91 AMCCOM (DSD-PC) - Provide to SPCC the data elements "contract award date," "contract number," and "contractor name" for FY-91 and FY-92 procurements of 2E and 2T ammunition. Due during the Navy Program Review at AMCCOM on 1 April 1991.

4/91 AMCCOM (DSD-PC) - Provide SPCC the data elements requested in the 3/91 AMCCOM (DSD-PC) action (provide data for active FY-90 procurements and all FY-91 procurements).

4/91 NAVAIR - Action from March 1991 still open.

4/91 SPCC - For FY-90 active procurements and all FY-91 procurements, provide the data elements identified in the March 1991 SPCC action.

4/91 WPNSTA Earle/NOS IH/SPCC - After SPCC collects all data elements for this action, jointly summarize the data to show any Indian Head trends, problems, etc., for the next meeting.

6/91 SPCC - Continue to collect and further analyze/summarize the data into following analysis groups: PM, Contractor Type (GOCO/GOGO/COCO), dollar value, time of funding, ISEA, and commodity.

8/91 SPCC - Continue to collect and further analyze/summarize the data.

8/91 NOS IH - Don Burtchette to provide CART/CAD FY-90 and FY-91 reports on items on same format as SPCC.

10/91 SPCC - Don Burtchette to provide CART/CAD FY-90 and FY-91 reports on items close to the format provided by SPCC. SPCC to compile data and continue analysis on a quarterly basis.

10/91 SPCC - With WPNSTA Earle (S. Rideout), plot data by quarter, by commodity, by 2E & 2T similar to the line charts presented by PAT chairman: (a) summary line chart, (b) chart by 2E & 2T, and © chart by commodity.

11/91 NWSC Crane (5025/504)/PMTTC (2041)/WPNSTA Earle (5013)/

ACTION #17-1090 (CONTINUED)

NOS IH (5710) - For the data collection form provided by SPCC on 11/91 (FY-90 & 91 execution time), fill in the following elements: ISEA, Commodity Type, Contract Type, date PDPs were due as requested by AMCCOM - (2) date PDPs were submitted by ISEA to AMCCOM. Also provide definitions of all the data columns/elements in the data collection form as a routine part of the form/data.

11/91 WPNSTA Earle - With the assistance of SPCC/NWAC (MS-16)/NOS IH (5710), develop trend charts summarizing the date/time frames in the SPCC data collection form. WPNSTA Earle - Present charts at next meeting.

4/92 WPNSTA Earle - Continue updating trend charts as new data becomes available. Do not include data in the summary charts which has a low % of data points.

4/92 PEO(T)/NSWC Crane (PM4) - Provide SPCC with receipt of funding dates for FY-91 and FY-92 procurement programs.

4/92 PEO(T)/AMCCOM (AMSMC-QAM)/NWSCC (402) - Provide SPCC due dates and forwarding dates of PDPs for FY-90 through FY-93 procurements. (Fill in SPCC spread sheet.)

6/92 PEO(T)/NSWC Crane (PM4) - Add the date the PM receives the funds on the LOA to SPCC, for the FY-93 procurements.

6/92 PEO(T) - Provide SPCC with receipt of funding dates for FY-91 and FY-92 procurement programs (PMTIC cog items only).

6/92 WPNSTA Earle - Update trend charts and add FY-92 data to the charts.

6/92 NSWC Crane (PM4)/PEO(T)/SPCC/AMCCOM (DS) - Review the "Lead Time Summary" data provided by WPNSTA Earle. Discuss what they can or have done to reduce the times.

8/92 NSWC IH (570D) - Coordinate with NAVAIR to assure the date the PM receives the funds is on the allotment NAVAIR sends to SPCC.

8/92 WPNSTA Earle - Action of 6/92 remains open.

8/92 NSWC Crane (PM4)/SPCC/AMCCOM (DS) - Action of 6/92 remains open.

1/93 NSWC Indian Head (570D) - Action on 8/92 remains open.

1/93 WPNSTA Earle - Continue to collect and present summarized data charts.

1/93 AMCCOM (DSS) - Investigate why the current Form 38 FDPs do not match the FDPs on the original PP2s from which SPCC extracted the FDPs data.

1/93 AMCCOM (QAM) - Assure the DCAS Acceptance Report (automated DD250s) can be sent automatically to SPCC.

1/93 AMCCOM (PDM-C) - Investigate where AMCCOM gets and files the "date the ammunition is accepted" in preparation for the OSD CAWCF Hearings. Per PDM this date is used as a measure to

ACTION #17-1090 (CONTINUED)

determine which orders are delinquent. The Navy currently uses the "date the ammunition enters the Navy's inventory" in determining delinquent orders.

4/93 AMCCOM (DSS) - Make sure the PP-2s going to the Services are filled out completely per the DOD 5160.65M, latest revision of Chapter 6. Several fields of data were missing on the March 93 submit; e.g. block 20, production data; block 21, lead time data; block 23, remarks.

4/93 SPCC - Use lead times from the form 38s and not PP-2s, in the spread sheet of this action 17-1090. The form 38s represent current production programs where as the PP-2s represent future lead times.

4/93 WPNSTA Earle - Continue to collect and present summarized data charts. Try to identify the parts of the process which appear to be out of control/take too long. Recommend what fields of data are no longer required to be collected as those pieces of the process are under control.

4/93 AMCCOM (QAM) - Action of 1/93 remains open.

4/93 AMCCOM (PDM-C) - Action of 1/93 remains open.

7/93 AMCCOM (PDM-D & DSS) - On the latest SPCC data sheet for this action, fill in the column "acceptance date" which indicates the date the material was accepted, e.g a DD-250 was signed. Only provide data when the first lot of all up rounds were accepted. Provide data to SPCC by 30 July.

7/93 WPNSTA Earle - Action of 4/93 remains open. Add FY 93 data also.

7/93 AMCCOM (DSS) - Report the status of the System Change Request which DSS submitted to assure all elements of the PP-2 could be provided to the Services per action of 4/93.

9/93 SPCC/WPNSTA Earle - Provide data with summarized trend charts for the following data elements only; date the MIPR is forwarded to SMCA; date the MIPR is accepted by the SMCA; contract award date; date first lot is released to the Navy (date of the MRO); date the first lot is delivered (shows up in inventory) and the date the last lot is delivered.

1/94 SPCC/Earle - Action of 9/93 remains open.

4/94 IMSD - Provide data with summarized trend charts for the following data elements only; date the MIPR is forwarded to SMCA; date the MIPR is accepted by the SMCA; contract award date; date first lot is released to the Navy (date of the MRO); date the first lot is delivered (shows up in inventory) and the date the last lot is delivered. Make sure the column headings on the spread sheet provided as back up are clearly stated.

6/94 IMSD - Continue to provide summarized trend charts with supporting data in the same format provided 6/94.

ACTION # 17-1090 (CONTINUED)

6/94 AMCCOM (DS), (QAM), NVLNO - Fill in all blank spaces (columns I through M) in the data sheet provided 6/94 by IMSD. Provide completed data sheets to IMSD by 1 Sep 94.

10/94 AMCCOM (DS), NVLNO - Fill in as many of the blank spaces (columns I through M) as possible in the data sheet provided 10/94 by IMSD. Provide completed data sheets to IMSD by 1 Nov 94.

10/94 IMSD - Continue to provide summarized trend charts with supporting data in the same format provided 10/94. Also provide data to PM4 on a disc during the PAT meeting. Remove from the data base, those MIPRs for which not all the fields can be filled in by AMCCOM per action of 10/94.

10/94 AMCCOM (PDM) - Select 5 FY 92/93 items from the IMSD list presented 10/94 and further breakdown the AMCCOM times and reasons for the time required, e.g. acceptance of MIPR to contract award took 122 days, what are the detailed reasons.

1/95 AMCCOM (PDM) - Action of 10/94 remains open.

1/95 IMSD - Continue to collect data in same format presented in the 1/95 meeting. Only brief data on annual basis (next due Jan 96).

4/95 IMSD - Action of 1/95 due Jan 96.

2/96 IMSD - Continue to collect data in same format presented in the 2/96 meeting except add charts showing trends for each category in the summary charts. Don't trend incomplete data e.g. 1st receipt to completion for FYs with limited data. Only brief data on annual basis (**next due Feb 97**).

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

3/91 SPCC - Per the January 1991 action, all available data extracted from the PPSL data base were provided. The excluded data elements were: date PM signed PA, date SPCC received PA, quantity to procure, SMCA Contract number, contractor name, date SMCA awarded contract, MIPR or PR number, date material accepted, date material received by depot. Several of these elements, as portrayed in the March 1991 (DSD-PL) actions, can only be provided by AMCCOM. Others, such as the dates the material was accepted and received by depots, may be next to impossible to acquire.

3/91 - Action Item Number 15-1090, "Timeliness of Procurement Funding being sent to AMCCOM and SPCC," was combined into this action.

4/91 SPCC - Provided a "format" spread sheet displaying all the necessary data elements. Not all data had been received from AMCCOM and NAVAIR as assigned March 1991. AMCCOM (DSD) has committed to add the data elements "contract award date,"

ACTION # 17-1090 (CONTINUED)

"contract number," and "contractor name" to future Form 38s. In fact, SPCC/AMCCOM (DSD) are working on a revised Form 38 to present to JOCG/Acquisition Subgroup. They will solicit other Navy input. Hopefully, the revised Form 38 will better meet the Services' needs.

6/91 SPCC - Provided summarized data showing the average number of days for the various time frames and activities with the "Administrative Lead Time" and "Production Lead Time." Further analysis was required.

10/91 SPCC - Provided summarized data showing the average number of days for the various time frames and activities with the "Administrative Lead Time" and "Production Lead Time." Analysis as follows:

Performance Stat.	Long(days)	Short(days)	Goal(days)
P.O. Received	158	23.73	30
PA Received	76	1.00	10
PDIN Forward	23.39	3.00	7
PDIN Accepted	32.94	6.88	5

Sufficient data have not been captured to warrant analysis on other time points.

11/91 SPCC - Provided raw data with the data elements "ISEA, commodity and contractor type" missing. Data was not summarized except the average number of days from 1 October 1991 to receipt of funds at SPCC. The group addressed the fact that the data for the #1 PAT indicator, "late PDPs and execution by time" was supposed to be gathered by SPCC as a part of this action. The data provided by SPCC was missing the data element to measure late PDPs.

4/92 WPNSTA Earle - Briefed PAT on development of trend charts summarizing the date/time frames in the SPCC data collection forms.

4/92 SPCC - Provided a spread sheet with all the data elements listed but several data points were missing, e.g., dates PMs received the funds and the date the PDPs were sent to AMCCOM.

6/92 SPCC - Provided data collected to date. Some 2E data is still required for PMTC cog items on receipt of funds by the PM.

The rest of the 2E/2T data were provided. Appropriate data is needed on the LOA from each PM. AMCCOM (BAT) could not get the dates that AMCCOM received the Army PDPs.

6/92 WPNSTA Earle - Provided summarized data for FY-90 and FY-91 (up to PDIN acceptance only).

8/92 - No action taken.

1/93 SPCC - Reported the FDP on the Form 38 does not match the original PP2 FDP from which the data was originally taken.

ACTION #17-1090 (CONTINUED)

1/93 WPNSTA Earle - Provided summarized data for FY 90 through FY 92 (up to PDIN acceptance only).

4/93 WPNSTA Earle - Provided summarized data for FY 90 through FY 92 which illustrated all fields of data including final delivery of all assets into the inventory. Several fields of data are potentially not needed any more since the trend data shows some pieces of the process are under control.

4/93 AMCCOM (DSS) - Stated the form 38s are based on form 45 data which could differ from PP-2s since the lead times on the 45s are programs already in production and those on the PP-2s could be for out years. The group agreed SPCC should use the lead times on the form 38s and PM4A gave SPCC a copy of the AMCCOM master lead time list to use as a reference only as necessary.

7/93 WPNSTA Earle/SPCC - Reported specific problems with getting the exact day of the month for several data fields, e.g. acceptance date and PDP request date. No charts were provided.

7/93 AMCCOM (DSS) - Stated a System Change Request had been submitted by DSS to the Information Management Group at AMCCOM to assure all fields of the PP-2 could be filled in as the Services had agreed to at the various JOCG/ACQ meetings.

7/93 AMCCOM (PDM-C) - Stated the "date the ammunition is accepted" is on the P-21 forms submitted to the Services. The date is month only and not exact date.

9/93 NSWC Crane (PM4C) - Presented 2E/2T SPC charts displaying the number of days and data distribution of the various time frames which this action was trying to capture. Year to year trend charts for FY 90 through 92 was also provided. After several hours of debate all data elements for this action were canceled and considered under control except for the following: date the MIPR is forwarded to SMCA; date the MIPR is accepted by the SMCA; contract award date; date first lot is released to the Navy (date of the MRO); date the first lot is delivered (shows up in inventory) and the date the last lot is delivered.

9/93 AMCCOM (DSS) - Stated the System Change to assure all elements of the PP-2 could be provided to the Services per action of 4/93 was not done yet but it should be by the Presidents Budget submit in January 1994.

4/94 IMSD - Provided an example page of the back up spread sheet showing the elements listed as requested in action of 9/93. The column headings again confused the PAT members and some of the headings had to be explained. The members requested that in the future the headings be changed to clearly state what the data represents, e.g. for contract award date use the exact/abbreviated name for the heading (contr award date).

ACTION #17-1090 (CONTINUED)

6/94 IMSD - Provided a detailed data sheet (with clear headings) and a summarized trend chart for following elements: date the MIPR is forwarded to SMCA; date the MIPR is accepted by the SMCA; contract award date; date first lot is released to the Navy (date of the MRO); date the first lot is delivered (shows up in inventory) and the date the last lot is delivered. Data was for FY 90 through 92 MIPRs.

10/94 IMSD - Provided FY 90, 91 & 92 data as of Aug 94 with all the same fields as outlined in 6/94 action taken above. For FY 90 MIPRs, 95 were complete of a total of 109 MIPRs issued. For FY 91, 77 of 109 were complete. And for FY 92, 45 of 109 were complete. There was still some data which had not been provided by AMCCOM yet but it was felt some of it may not be available.

1/95 IMSD - Provided FY 90-92 data as of Dec 94. Also provided the raw data for all fields. Summarized data also provided. The PAT decided the data only needs to be provided on an annual basis (next data due Jan 96).

5/95 PM4 - Decided to close the PDM 1/95 part of this action. This was based on the IOC reorganization causing to much confusion at this time.

2/96 IMSD - Provided FY 90- 94 data as of Dec 95. No adverse trends were noted. All 102 FY 90 MIPRs are complete with most of the 91/92 being complete. The average # of days for the following 7 categories; 1 oct to the date the MIPR was forwarded to the SMCA, days it took SMCA to accept MIPR, SMCA acceptance of the MIPR to Contract award, Contract award to 1st MRO, 1st MRO to 1st receipt, 1ST receipt to complete and total days. The PAT decided the data only needs to be provided on an annual basis (next data due Jan 97)

3/97 IMSD - Stated they were unable to provide data at this time due to a change in database management of the spreadsheet. They had changed over the Windows 95 and had some compatibility problems.

3/97 ALL - The Standing Working Group, formally the PAT, decided to close this action. The QMB has evolved into more of a tiger team concept and no longer wanted indicators. We decided to no longer operate as a PAT but rather as a Standing Working Group with more formal information/issue briefs and work the hot issues as they arise.

**2E/2T ACQUISITION STANDING WORKING GROUP
(SWG)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 18-1090 **REQ COMPLETION DATE:**

ISSUE/PROBLEM: Performance measurement: Number of MIPR amendments and analysis of reasons for amendments.

STATUS: OPEN: **MONITOR:** CLOSED: XXX

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: ROSETTA WHITE

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

10/90 SPCC - For FY-88 through FY-91 procurements, provide the number of MIPRs by Cog and FY, number of MIPR amendments, and an analysis of the reasons for the amendments.

1/91 SPCC (2E)/NWSCC (2T) - Continue to measure the reasons for the amendments. Use the same formats as provided by NWSCC (Code 5025) during the January 1991 meeting. Further breakdown/define the reasons for the high numbered items (Numbers 2 through 7) provided by NWSCC.

3/91 SPCC (2E and 2T) - On an annual basis, provide MIPR amendments data, tracking the amendments made due to changes in quantity, CRDD, ADL, and destination. Assure data are summarized to show trends, if any.

8/91 - Next report will be in October.

10/91 SPCC - Further refine data by type of MIPR change and define changes for all of FY-91. PMA-201F2 to provide data on type of MIPR change for 2E COG for FY-91.

11/91 SPCC - Provide summarized MIPR amendment charts showing the role-up of all 2T & 2E received during FY-91 (all FY MIPRs). Collect the same for FY-92 on a quarterly basis to be reported at each PAT meeting. Charts/Data should show as a minimum the following elements: FY of original MIPR, 2T vs. 2E and reasons for amendments. Use 2T FY-91 data provided by 5025 on 11/91 as a baseline.

4/92 SPCC - Continue providing summarized MIPR amendment charts. Take a cross section of commodities to see where the problem is on destination changes not being implemented.

4/92 SPCC/AMCCOM (DS/PD) - Review knowledge acquisition process flow chart to ensure the flow chart adequately captures the MIPR change process.

6/92 SPCC - Continue providing MIPR amendment charts. Breakdown the FY-91 and FY-92 data to identify the MIPR amendments by FY of funds, category/reason for amendment and 2E vs 2T.

ACTION # 18-1090 (CONTINUED)

8/92 SPCC - Continue with action of 6/92.
1/93 SPCC - Continue to collect data and present on a quarterly basis.
4/93 SPCC - Continue to collect data and present on a quarterly bases.
7/93 SPCC - Continue to collect data and present on a quarterly bases.
9/93 SPCC - Action of 7/93 remains open.
1/94 SPCC - Continue to collect data and present on a quarterly base.
4/94 IMSD - Continue to collect data and present on a quarterly bases.
6/94 IMSD - Action of 4/94 remains open.
10/94 IMSD - Continue to collect data and present on a quarterly bases. Quantify exactly what MIPRs are in the data base, e.g. FMS, BW 2T, SOF 2T and etc. Take out FMS in the future if included.
10.94 NSWC (402), IMSD - Define and present the reasons for the 44 ADL changes in the 3rd quarter of FY 94 as presented by IMSD on 10/94.
1/95 IMSD - Continue to collect data provided 1/95 and present on a quarterly bases.
4/95 IMSD - Continue to collect data provided 1/95 and present on a quarterly bases.
7/95 IMSD - Continue to collect data provided 1/95 and present on a quarterly bases.
2/96 IMSD - Continue to collect data provided 2/96 but only present on an annual basis (due Feb 97). Add a note at the bottom of the summary chart e.g. "data represents all MIPR amendments during the FY regardless of the year of the MIPR/funds".

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

1/91 NWSC Crane (Code 5025) - Provided data on (2T) for FY-88 through FY-90. The largest number of changes was attributed to changes in quantity, unit prices, CRDD, funding, ADL, and destination.

3/91 NWSC Crane (Code 5025) - Provided status of 2T MIPR amendments. The causes for these follow.

ITEM

2. Quantity changes are due to price changes from SMCA or budget changes forcing buying to availability. Standard Fixed Price concept should minimize price changes.

3. CRDD changes are due to NAVSEA not assigning or incorrectly

ACTION # 18-1090 (CONTINUED)

assigning CRDDs (specifically FY-88). No significant problem after FY-88.

4. Funding changes listed were due to planning MIPRs which were amended to provide initial funds at the start of the FY. Planning MIPRs have been discontinued.

5. Change to unit cost is the same reason as Action Item Number 2.

6. ADL number changes are primarily due to PM4 executing the budget (different technical and new requirements decisions by the Fleet); primarily the SOF breakout.

7. Change of destination was driving by PM4 to force new production deliveries to the most current required destination which had changed since the original MIPR (up to three years prior). This will continue to be done.

3/91 SPCC - Provided status of 2E MIPR amendments similar to 2T data discussed above. Only Items 2 (quantity change), 3 (CRDD change), 6 (ADL change), and 7 (change in destination) need to be monitored in the future (annually).

10/91 SPCC - provided the following data on MIPR amendments:

	<u>2T COG</u>	<u>2E COG</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
Quantity chg	34	3	37
ADL chg	29	0	29
Dest chg	16	12	28
Other chg	45	9	54

11/91 NWSC Crane (5025) - Provided MIPR amendment data for (2T) ammunition showing all amendments occurring during FY-91 and total amendments since the original MIPR. The amendments were broken down by FY of original MIPR (FY-88 through FY-91) and reasons for the amendments. Of the 94 amendments received in FY-91 (all FY MIPRs), the major reasons were quantity changes, ADL number changes, change in destination, canceled MIPR and funding line changes.

4/92 SPCC - Provided MIPR amendment charts showing the roll-up of all 2T and 2E items received during FY-91 (all FY MIPRs).

6/92 SPCC - Provided updated MIPR amendments charts showing amendments during FY-91 and FY-92 through March 1992.

8/92 SPCC - Provided updated MIPR amendment charts through June 1992.

1/93 SPCC - Provided updated MIPR amendment charts through the first quarter of FY 93. Data represents the number of MIPR amendments that occurred during the FY listed.

4/93 SPCC - Provided updated MIPR amendment charts through March 1993. Data was for FY 91 through FY 93 and represented the number of MIPR amendments that occurred during the FY listed.

ACTION # 18-1090 (CONTINUED)

7/93 SPCC - Provided updated MIPR amendment charts through June 1993.

1/94 SPCC - Provided updated MIPR amendment charts through the 1st quarter of FY 94. The total FY 93 price changes = 1; total quantity changes = 37; total canceled MIPRs = 3; total destination changes = 31; and total ADL changes = 63. Discussion centered around why there were 63 ADL changes this time with no obvious reason noted. It was thought by the technical activities that the ozone depleting substance (ODS) problem may have caused most of them.

4/94 IMSD - Provided updated charts through 2nd qtr of FY 94. The FY 94 data showed a substantial decrease in ADL changes. This was because per another PAT action ADL-CNs do not always require a MIPR change like in the past.

10/94 IMSD - Provided MIPR amendment charts for all of FY 91 through 94. The only area of concern was the 44 ADL changes in the 3rd quarter of FY 94. Not sure if the data included FMS.

1/95 IMSD - Provided MIPR amendment data for all FY 91 through 1st qtr FY 95. Data did not include FMS.

1/95 NSWC CR (4025) - Addressed the 44 ADL-CNs IMSD had mentioned in the 10/94 meeting. The CNs are addressed in action #54-1091.

In addition the group agreed that MIPR amendments are no longer needed for ADL CNs as previously stated in action #80.

4/95 IMSD - Provided MIPR amendment 2T/2E charts for FY 91 through the second quarter of FY 95. No real area of concern for first 2 quarters of FY 95. All appears to be getting better.

7/95 IMSD - Provided MIPR amendment 2T/2E charts for FY 91 through the third quarter of FY 95. Destination changes appeared to be going down. Not sure we are still making adequate destination changes just prior to shipment or are we getting better at the initial guess on destination.

2/96 IMSD - Provided MIPR amendment 2T/2E charts for FY 91 through the first quarter of FY 96. ADL changes have gone down primarily because Crane 402 has stopped requesting MIPR amendments for ADL CNs as agreed to by the PAT, 1/95 action taken. The group agreed to have this action reported annually with the next report due Jan 97.

3/97 IMSD - Provided MIPR amendment 2T/2E charts for FY 96 through the first quarter of FY 97.

3/97 Group - The Standing Working Group, formally the PAT, decided to close this action. The QMB has evolved into more of a tiger team concept and no longer wanted indicators. We decided to no longer operate as a PAT but rather as a Standing Working Group with more formal information/issue briefs and work the hot issues as they arise.

**2E/2T ACQUISITION/PRODUCTION
PROCESS ACTION TEAM (PAT)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 19-1090 **REQ COMPLETION DATE:** SEPT 93

ISSUE/PROBLEM: Performance measurement: PP2 changes required between submissions (May, August and December of each year).

STATUS: OPEN: **MONITOR:** CLOSED: XXX

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: J. D. LYNCH

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

10/90 NAVAIR (2E Cog)/NWSC Crane (2T Cog) - For calendar year 1990, provide the following data:

<u>DATE OF PP2 SUBMISSION</u>	<u>NO. OF PP2s</u>	<u>NO. OF PP2s CHANGED FROM LAST SUBMISSION</u>	<u>RATIONALE FOR PP2 CHANGE FY ON PP2</u>
MAY		N/A	N/A
AUGUST			
DECEMBER			

1/91 NWSC Crane/NAVAIR - Standardize and summarize the data requested above (October 1990) as provided by NWSCC (PM4) in January 1991. Assure January 1991 data are included. These summarized data should show changes from May 1990 to August 1990 and then again from August 1990 to January 1991. Further categorize and summarize the reasons the changes took place. If the reasons are based on changing OPNAV budget guidance between submissions, research past-year guidance for historical comparison. (For NAVAIR only:) Summarize prior data (FY-87 through FY-90) provided at the January 1991 meeting for historical comparison to FY-91 data being collected above.

3/91 NWSC Crane/NAVAIR - For a sample of 15 (2T) and 15 (2E) items, provide a spread sheet similar to the following:

	<u>MAY 90</u>	<u>AUG 90</u>	<u>JAN 91</u>	<u>MAY 91</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
FY-90	Element				
	Element				
FY-91	*Define data elements (2-5) within each FY, e.g., percentage of PP2s changed due to quantity changes and percent of PP2s changed due to DODIC changes.				

ACTION #19-1090 (CONTINUED)

FY-92

FY-93

FY-94

3/91 NAVAIR - Finalize the above March 1991 spread sheet and coordinate with NWSCC (PM4 and Code 5025) to assure consistent 2E and 2T data are provided at the next meeting.

/91 NWSC Crane/NAVAIR - Action from March 1991 remains open for further breakdown of elements.

10/91 NWSC Crane/NAVAIR - PMA-201F2 to coordinate with PMA-201B6 to further refine data. NWSCC to continue to update as additional data becomes available.

11/91 NWSC Crane/NAVAIR - Continue to update PP2 change data following each PP2 submission date.

4/92 NWSC Crane/PEO(T) - Continue to update PP2 change data. The next due date is October 1992 to measure changes from the NAVCOMPT 94/95 to the OSD submit.

1/93 NSWC Crane (PM4) - Continue to update the PP2 change data. The next submit will measure changes from the August 1992 OSD to the January 1993 Congressional submit.

4/93 NSWC Crane (PM4) - Update the PP2 change data. The next submit will measure changes from the March 1993 Presidents budget to the May 1993 Navcompt budget.

7/93 NSWC Crane (PM4) - Action of 4/93 remains open since.

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

1/91 NWSC Crane - Provided data showing 64 percent of PP2s required changes from the May to August 1990 PP2 submission.

1/91 NAVAIR - Provided historical data back through FY-87. Of the 37 commodities analyzed June 1987 through September 1990, each commodity changed over the three-year period an average of 2.5 times.

3/91 NWSC Crane (PM4) - Provided brief on 2T PP2 changes. Comparison was provided from May 1990 to August 1990 (239 changes) and again from August 1990 to January 1991 Submit (293 changes). The reasons: quantity changes, DODIC change, PP2 deletion, new PP2s, and Budget Guidance were summarized.

8/91 NWSC Crane - Bring data to next meeting. Next report will be in October.

10/91 NAVAIR/NWSC Crane - NAVAIR data showed an average of .3 changes per DODIC on a total of 25 FY-91 procurements. Further refinement of prior year data is needed. NWSCC analyzed data for PP2 submission from May to August 1991. Analysis indicates major changes occurred in quantity changes in FY-92 and FY-93 planned

ACTION #19-1090 (CONTINUED)

procurements. Significant additions were made due to maintenance requirements (additions) for FY-92 procurements.

11/91 NAVAIR - Provided 2E data showing PP2 change data from May 1990 to August 1991. During FY-91 an average of 27 percent of the PP2s required change with each PP2 submission.

4/92 PEO(T)/NSWC Crane (PM4A) - Provided 2E/2T data showing PP2 change data from January 1992. Detailed analysis was also provided for 2T showing why the PP2s were changed from budget to budget. All agreed the process appears to be in control but would continue to collect data at least one more time, October 1992 after OSD submit. This will assure all POM-94 affects are over and measure changes from the NAVCOMPT 94/95 to the OSD.

1/93 NSWC Crane (PM4A) - Provided 2T data showing the PP2 changes from the May 1992 NAVCOMPT submit to the August 1992 OSD submit.

A total of 196 qty changes, 37 add-ons and 19 deletions were reported. Nearly all changes were due to POM 94/95 fluctuations, either GAO cuts or NAVCOMPT plus ups, adjustments for unit pack and the fact that the NAVCOMPT submit had to be submitted before fixed standard prices were provided by the SMCA.

4/93 NSWC Crane (PM4A) - Provided 2T data showing the PP-2 changes from the August 1992 (OSD budget) to the March 1993 (Presidents budget). A total of 226 qty changes (by FY) affecting 150 actual MIPRS was illustrated. Only nine additions (DODICs/PP-2s) were noted of which only three affected FY 93/94/95 procurements of all up rounds. Some were reno components. Only eight deletions were noted of which only two affected FY 93/94/95 procurements.

7/93 NSWC Crane (PM4) - Stated the NAVCOMPT PP-2 submit was just made 24 June 1993 and a comparison with the Presidents submit could not be made before this meeting in 6/93.

9/93 NSWC (PM4A) - Provided 2T data showing PP2 change data comparing the March 1993 Presidents Budget to the June 1993 Budget. Of the total 249 PP2s submitted in June there were 5% DODIC add-ons and 3% DODIC deletions of which only about 1/2 affected the FY 94-96 buys. There were also 35% with quantity changes due to inventory baseline changes, control changes and etc. Less than 1/2 of the quantity changes affected the FY 94-96 buys. Similar data was shown for SMCA and non SMCA buys. The group agreed to close this action.

**2E/2T ACQUISITION PROCUREMENT/PRODUCTION
PROCESS ACTION TEAM (PAT)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 20-1090

REQ COMPLETION DATE:

ISSUE/PROBLEM: Performance measurement: The time taken to complete the Government First Article Test (FAT) and the Lot Acceptance Test (LAT). Are we meeting the 45 FAT and 30 LAT day requirements?

STATUS: OPEN:

MONITOR:

CLOSED: XXX

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: BRAD SITZ
TOM GREEN

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

10/90 AMCCOM (SMCA PROCURED 2T/2E ITEMS) AND SPCC (ALL OTHER 2T/2E ITEMS) - For FY-88 through FY-90 procurements, provide data illustrating the actual time taken to complete Government FAT and LAT Tests.

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

1/91 AMCCOM AND SPCC - Provided status/discussion. Virtually all the FAT and LAT day limit requirements are being met.

1/91 - Closed. Acceptable extensions to the FAT and LAT limits are addressed in action item #12-1090.

**2E/2T ACQUISITION PROCUREMENT/PRODUCTION
PROCESS ACTION TEAM (PAT)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 21-1090 **REQ COMPLETION DATE:** JUL 91

ISSUE/PROBLEM: Performance measurement: Pre-awards performed on Navy developed items without Navy Technical Activity participation.

STATUS: OPEN: MONITOR: **CLOSED:** XXX

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: SARA BROWN
ART STANTON
ALL ISEA/CFA MEMBERS

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

10/90 AMCCOM (SMCA PROCURED 2T/2E ITEMS) AND WPNSTA Earle (ALL OTHER 2T/2E ITEMS) - Provide the following for FY-90 procurements on Navy developed items:

Number of Pre-Awards done
Number of times Navy was invited
Number of times Navy participated
Assure 2T and 2E can be separated

1/91 AMCCOM - For FY-91 procurements, monitor and provide the above 10/90 requested data elements.

1/91 WPNSTA Earle - For FY-91 procurements, monitor and provide the above 10/90 requested data elements.

1/91 ALL ISEA/CFA MEMBERS - Assist AMCCOM and WPNSTA Earle in collecting the above data.

3/91 AMCCOM & ALL ISEA/CFA MEMBERS - Actions of 1/91 remain open.

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

3/91 WPNSTA Earle - Provided data stating ISEA/CFA were invited, participated in and in most cases involved in the decision to perform pre-awards. This was FY-90 procurements.

6/91 - Action closed based on reopening Action #7-990. No AMCCOM focal point for this data which needs to be established first.

In addition, some of this data is being collected in Action #4-990 on a sample basis for 2T ammunition.

**2E/2T ACQUISITION PROCUREMENT/PRODUCTION
PROCESS ACTION TEAM (PAT)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 22-1090 **REQ COMPLETION DATE:** ONGOING

ISSUE/PROBLEM: Performance measurement: Future production dollars lost in the budget process due to late deliveries from procurement.

STATUS: OPEN: MONITOR: **CLOSED:** XXX

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: ANTHONY JOSEPH
J. D. LYNCH

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

10/90 NWSC Crane (2T)/NAVAIR (2E) - Provide production dollars lost due to late deliveries, itemized by general category (e.g., 5"/54) and FY.

1/91 NWSC Crane/NAVAIR - Continue to monitor and provide status.

3/91 NWSC Crane/NAVAIR - Continue to monitor dollars lost due to late deliveries. Provide next update July 1991 after the NAVCOMPT budget.

8/91 NAVAIR - PMA-201F2 to provide data, by 13 September 1991, on funds lost due to late delivery.

10/91 NAVAIR/NWSC Crane - Continue to provide data on funds lost due to late delivery.

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

1/91 NWSC Crane/NAVAIR - Provided data indicating the following dollars were lost:

	<u>FY-89</u>	<u>FY-90</u>	<u>FY-91</u>	<u>FY-92</u>
2E	N/A	26.9 mil	0	30.8 mil
2T	18.6 mil	0	32.7 mil	0

3/91 NWSC Crane/NAVAIR - No additional funds lost due to late

deliveries. Recommended next collection point be July 1991 after the NAVCOMPT budget.

10/91 NAVAIR - The only 2E program which lost future funding due to late deliveries was the Gator program. The Gator program lost \$9.8M in FY-92 due to production delays in thermal batteries and dispensers. The 2E data provided in January 1990 showing 30.8M was in error.

10/91 NWSC Crane - No 2T funding was lost due to late deliveries in 93 NAVCOMPT (July 92).

**2E/2T ACQUISITION PROCUREMENT/PRODUCTION
PROCESS ACTION TEAM (PAT)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 24-191 **REQ COMPLETION DATE:** AUG 91

ISSUE/PROBLEM: Navy activities do not receive advance notice (specific arrival date) of new procurement items from contractors. Note: Action referenced to PAT Number 3 by Pat Number 4.

STATUS: OPEN: MONITOR: **CLOSED:** XXX

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: TOM GREEN

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

1/91 AMCCOM (SMCA PROCURED 2E/2T ITEMS)/SPCC (ALL OTHER 2E/2T ITEMS) - Request contracting officer assistance in assuring contractors provide advance notification, receiving activities. Provide status at next meeting.

3/91 WPNSTA Earle - Check with WPNSTA Earle (Code 20) to determine whether they are getting PMRC cards through CAIMS from SPCC, and whether they are getting 24-hour notice, per the FAR clause on full truckloads. Provide data on ten shipments WPNSTA Earle has recently received.

3/91 NWSC Crane (PM4) - Brief the FAR clause for shipment to the QMB. Do we need to implement this FAR clause on partial loads in addition to full loads as currently implied?

3/91 ALL CFAs/ISEAs/QAM-I - At all post awards, assure the contractor is aware and understands the FAR clause on shipments.

4/91 SPCC - Investigate whether PMRC cards are being sent back to SPCC to denote receipt of new production; if so, quantify and provide data at next meeting.

4/91 ALL CFAs/ISEA/QAM-I - Provide details at the next meeting on the documentation or process set in place to assure that the CFA/ISEA/QAM-I actions of 3/91 are implemented at all post awards. (This includes Action Items 24-191, 25-191 and 26-191.)

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

REFERENCE - PAT Number 4 memo 8000 of 29 November 1990.

3/91 SPCC - The process of notification of shipments is a two-step process. When a contract is issued, Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) clause 52.242.12 is required both in SPCC and AMCCOM contracts. This clause requires the contractor to give 24 hour advance notice to the consignee for full truck-load or car-load shipments. When the delivery schedule is loaded into

ACTION #24-191 (CONTINUED)

the Procurement/Production Status List (PPSL) at SPCC, a Pre-positioned Material Receipt Card (PMRC) is issued by CAIMS. This gives the consignee advance notification of the item and the quantity to be delivered from the contractor. When the contractor ships the material and it is received by the consignee, the activity should complete the PMRC and send it over AUTODIN to SPCC. Contractor also references the Terminal Facilities Guide to see whether the consignee requires notification. No contract clause exists for partial shipments. 4/91 WPNSTA Earle - Provided a brief sheet indicating two out of

36 truck loads received at Earle did not have proper paper work (the two were not 2E or 2T items). Army load plants are usually better than contractors. Paperwork is buried in the shipment or destroyed. Prior notification of partial shipments was not a concern at Earle.

4/91 SPCC - Failure of stated WPNSTAs to notify SPCC by PMRC card, etc., is a problem. It is now labor-intensive to try to track deliveries to actual inventory gains.

8/91 SPCC - Have Navy activities include advance notice of shipment arrival date as an item in a contract award check-list.

**2E/2T ACQUISITION PROCUREMENT/PRODUCTION
PROCESS ACTION TEAM (PAT)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 25-191	REQ COMPLETION DATE: CLOSED
-----------------------------------	------------------------------------

ISSUE/PROBLEM: Improper, incomplete, or missing documentation or packaging, including identification of security category, DOT marking, full nomenclatures stenciling, OPSCAN labels, MIL-STD-129 tags, black banding, and wooden pallets. Note: Action referral to PAT Number 3 by PAT Number 4.

STATUS:	OPEN:	MONITOR:	CLOSED: XXX
----------------	-------	----------	--------------------

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: BRAD SITZ
ART STANTON

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

1/19 NAVAIR - Coordinate with PAT Number 2 to assess whether this is a problem with technical data and, therefore, a PAT Number 2 action. If not, bring back to PAT Number 3 for further review at next meeting.

3/91 ISEA/CFA/QAM-I MEMBERS - Assure the contractor is aware and understands the proper documentation and packing criteria during all post awards.

3/91 NWSC Crane (PM4) - Write letter to PAT Number 4 stating PAT Number 3 has assigned action to ISEA/CFAs to assure contractors are aware and understand the proper documentation and packaging criteria during post awards.

4/91 ISEA/CFA/QAM-I MEMBERS - Action March 1991 remains open. Combine with action of April 1991 on Action Item Number 24-191.

6/91 WPNSTA Earle/AMCCOM (QAM-I) - Refer to Action Item

Number 24-191.

8/91 - Process will be reported at October team meeting.

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

REFERENCE - PAT Number 4 memo 8000 of 29 November 1990.

3/91 NAVAIR - PAT Number 2 responded to PAT Numbers 3 and 4 by NAVAIR letter 8000 Ser PMA-201B3/297 of 26 February 1991. PDPs contain the proper information for packaging, labeling, and security, and judged any additional action necessary as belonging to PAT Number 3.

10/91 AMCCOM - Contractors will be notified in the post-award meeting of the proper method for marking and identifying shipments.

**2E/2T ACQUISITION PROCUREMENT/PRODUCTION
PROCESS ACTION TEAM (PAT)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 26-191 **REQ COMPLETION DATE:** CLOSED

ISSUE/PROBLEM: Paperwork not readily accessible in carrier.

STATUS: OPEN: MONITOR: **CLOSED:** XXX

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: ART STANTON
 BRAD SITZ

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

1/91 WPNSTA Earle - Research and clarify issue with PAT Number 4. Identify documentation required to resolve issue.

3/91 ISEA/CFAs/QAM-I - During post awards, assure the contractor is aware and understands where to place paperwork/documentation inside trucks and so forth to assure ready access per NAVSEA (OP-3681).

4/91 ISEA/CFAs/QAM-I - Action of March 1991 remains open. Combine with action April 1991 of Action Item Number 24-191.

6/91 WPNSTA Earle/AMCCOM (QAM-I) - Refer to Action Item Number 24-191.

8/91 WPNSTA Earle - Progress will be updated at the next meeting.

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

REFERENCE - PAT Number 4 memo 8000 of 29 November 1990.

3/91 WPNSTA Earle - NAVSEA (OP-3681), "Motor Vehicle and Railcar Shipping Inspectors Manual for Ammunition, Explosives, and

Related Hazardous Material," provides all the direction necessary to assure paperwork is readily accessible in the carrier. Specifically, paragraph 1-7 of OP-3681.

10/91 AMCCOM - Contractors will be notified in the post-award meeting of the proper method for marking and identifying shipments. See Action Item Number 25-191.

**2E/2T ACQUISITION PROCUREMENT/PRODUCTION
PROCESS ACTION TEAM (PAT)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 27-191 **REQ COMPLETION DATE:** NEXT MTG

ISSUE/PROBLEM: Need briefing on CAD/PAD Procurement Process.

STATUS: OPEN: MONITOR: **CLOSED:** XXX

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: PAUL MILCETIC

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

1/91 NOS IH - Provide briefing of CAD/PAD Procurement Process at next meeting.

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

3/91 NOS IH - Brief provided by Don Burtchette. Acquisition Management of NAVAIR items was moved to NOS IH in 1990. Most CAD/PAD procurements are consolidated at NOS IH except part of the Air Force items. DOD has 2,400 total items, 1,200 still procured by Air Force. A JOCG Subgroup is being formed to address CADs/PADs Joint Services Issues. NOS IH is currently trying to use similar acquisition planning documents such as PP2s for CADs/PADs.

**2E/2T ACQUISITION PROCUREMENT/PRODUCTION
PROCESS ACTION TEAM (PAT)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 28-391 **REQ COMPLETION DATE:** ONGOING

ISSUE/PROBLEM: Brainstorming problems for each member's assigned part of the entire acquisition process.

STATUS: OPEN: MONITOR: **CLOSED:** XXX

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: ALL MEMBERS

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

3/91 - Brainstorm problems for each assigned part of the process and bring them to the next meeting. Use the format provided at the March 1991 meeting, which included: Action Item number, date, process area, process title, problem/issue, discussion/background, recommended solution, POC (member), and originator (if other than POC). Assigned process areas for all follow:

Process

Area

Area

Member

2.1 Manage Acquisition Program NWSCC (PM4) and NAVAIR

2.3.1	Dev. Procurement Plan	AMCCOM (DSD-PC and PDM-C)
2.3.2	Accept/Reject Funding	SPCC
2.3.3	Process Procurement	SPCC and AMCCOM (DSD-PC, PDM-C)
2.3.4	Process Solicitation	SPCC and AMCCOM (PCA-WW)
2.3.5	Administer Contract	SPCC and AMCCOM (PCA-WW)
2.4.1	Perform Post Award Planning	WPNSTA Earle and AMCCOM (QAM-I)
2.4.2	Evaluate First Article	NAVORDSTA IH (Code 5710)
2.4.3	Evaluate Production	NAVORDSTA IH (Code 5710) and NWAC Pomona (Code 3711)
2.4.4	Process Referrals	NWSCC (Code 5025) and PMTC (Code 2063)

6/91 ALL MEMBERS - Process actions of March 1991 remains open.

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

4/91

AREA 2.1 - Five problems were presented by PM4/AIR/SPCC. Actions assigned are in Action Numbers 30-491, 31-491, and 32-491.

ACTION #28-391 (CONTINUED)

AREA 2.3.3 - One problem was presented by SPCC. The action assigned is in Action Item Number 33-491.

AREA 2.4.2 - Four problems were presented by NAVORDSTA Indian Head (5710). Actions assigned are in 35-491, 36-491.

6/91

AREA 2.3.1/2.3.3 - AMCCOM (PDM-C) presented five problems. Actions are 2.3.3 assigned in 34-491, 38-691, and 39-691.

AREA 2.3.1 - AMCCOM (DSD-PC) presented one problem. "Purpose Code 9 on SOF assets cannot be identified within the actual AMCCOM or DESCOM activities." Action is being addressed between DS and SPCC outside of PAT Number 3.

AREA 2.4.1 - WPNSTA Earle presented two problems. No new actions were assigned. One already addressed is 4-990.

8/91 - No new actions assigned.

[illegible]

```

0          0          0 Annual Cost Avoidance 0          Value Added
0          0
CAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA×AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA×AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAA¶
0          0          3          3          0 Improved
3Improved 0
0 Element of Value 0 M/Yrs3$(K)*3 Material $(K)0 Quality (
)3Schedule ( )0
CAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA×AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA×AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAA¶
0 TOTAL (at bottom)0          3          3          0          3
0

```

*\$(K) in this column is based on man-years.

Example: Element of Value

1. Legibility - telephone call avoidance
M/Yrs = (350 PP2s) x (0.5 of all PP2s require calls)
x (0.5 two PP2s per call) x two people
x 1/12 hour/call

2. Accuracy, etc.

ACTION ITEM NO.
1/990

MEMBER
NWSC Crane (5025)/AMCCOM (DSD-PC)

2/990	NWSC Crane (5025)/NAVAIR
3/990	NWSC Crane (PM4)
4-990	SPCC/AMCCOM (PDM-C)
5-990	SPCC/AMCCOM (PDM-C)
7-990	WPNSTA Earle
12-1090	NAVORDSTA Indian Head (5710)
13-1090	WPNSTA Earle
18-1090	SPCC
21-1090	WPNSTA Earle
23-1090	NWSC Crane (PM4/5025)
24, 25, 26-191	WPNSTA Earle/AMCCOM (QAM-I)
30-491	NWSC Crane (PM4)/NAVAIR

Define elements of
Value for overall
process understanding NWSC Crane (504)

6/91 - All actions of April 1991 remain open.

8/91 - On hold until further guidance is provided by the Chairman
after the September QMB meeting.

10/91 - Action closed.

2E/2T ACQUISITION PROCUREMENT/PRODUCTION PROCESS ACTION TEAM (PAT)

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 30-491	REQ COMPLETION DATE: CLOSED
-----------------------------------	------------------------------------

ISSUE/PROBLEM: Actual Fleet usage of ammunition for training
does not equal the allocation (NCEA) or requirement (NCER).

STATUS:	OPEN:	MONITOR:	CLOSED: XXX
----------------	-------	----------	--------------------

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: ANTHONY JOSEPH

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

4/91 NWSC Crane (PM4) - Forward the issue to PAT Number 9 to try
to achieve better fleet NCER projections.

4/91 NWSC Crane (PM4) - Modify procurement strategy in the interim of PAT Number 9 action. Buy towards replacing the actual historical usage rather than NCEA/R.

6/91 NAVAIR - Provide status of April 1991 Action.

8/91 NAVAIR - Provide status of April 1991 Action.

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

4/91 DISCUSSION (PM4) - The PM procurement budget is developed based upon the projected need (PWRMR + NCEA), balanced against available assets (Current Inventory + Production Due-Ins) and the available budget dollars. When the actual Fleet usage does not equal or at least approximate the NCEA, many families of ammo will end up in an over-buy situation, and either NAVCOMPT or OSD will cut the PM budget dollars. This situation is compounded when the NCEA is much greater than the PWRMR, which is true of many smaller items (e.g., pyro and small arms) and for pure training rounds. In addition, the change of inventory baseline (six months to one year change) for the congressional Budget Submit in December of each year forces a drastic change in the PM Budget. The PM budget must continually be adjusted to save or redistribute funds, which causes a ripple effect of changing programs, changing PP2s, etc.

4/91 NWSC Crane (PM4) - Briefed the group on what NWSCC did with OPNAV, PAT Number 9 Chairman, and the CINCs at May 1991 meeting in OPNAV. All 2T was reviewed with recommendations to reduce NCER to more closely match the historical usage levels. Procurement strategies on 2T have been modified.

8/91 NAVAIR (PMA-201F2) - Review of NCER recommendations is continuing.

ACTION #30-491 (CONTINUED)

10/91 NAVAIR - PMA-201 deputy programs managers met with their respective OPNAV sponsors prior to FY-92 NCER submission. Several programs adjusted requirements. For instance, 2.75-inch rocket motor requirements were reduced by 50%. The MK 125 RATO program currently under review to increase requirements. The 2E COG program requirements are continually updated as additional inputs are received from the Fleet.

**2E/2T ACQUISITION PROCUREMENT/PRODUCTION
PROCESS ACTION TEAM (PAT)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER:	31-491	REQ COMPLETION DATE:	
----------------------------	--------	-----------------------------	--

ISSUE/PROBLEM: Costs and functions associated with Production Engineering funding are not well defined.

STATUS:	OPEN:	MONITOR:	CLOSED:	XXX
----------------	-------	----------	----------------	-----

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: JOHN WILDRIDGE

JACK PUCKETT
JOE BOKSER
ART STANTON

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

4/91 NWSC Crane (5025/504), NOS IH, WPNSTA Earle - Develop a detailed list of major functions the DA/AEA/CFAs perform. Assure these functions can be identified by DA, AEA OR CFA.

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

4/91 DISCUSSION (PM4) - Production Engineering is a line item in the PM budget. By definition Production Engineering is a part of each Subhead (e.g., 5"/54, Pyro, Small Arms). These budget estimates are based on the DA/AEA/CFA 5 year plans. Historically these 5 year plans appear to be based on a level of effort with very little details of the functions performed and the Man year/cost associated with these functions. In FY-91 some of the WPN Production Engineering funding was transferred by OSD to the O&MN line making it even more important to define and defend the production engineering portion of the budget.

6/91 NWSC Crane (PM4/5025) - Provided detailed functions and major functional tasks (2T) DAs, AEA, ISEA and QA activities. Functions are being used to develop a better 3 year plan and better define O&MN and WPN funded functions. Recommended action be closed as only (2T) PM had desired the data.

6/91 WPNSTA Earle - Provided documents specifying acquisition management and DA functions for 2T and 2E.

6/91 NOS IH - Provided production engineering functions for rocket systems.

6/91 - Action closed as PM4 had originally requested data.

**2E/2T ACQUISITION PROCUREMENT/PRODUCTION
PROCESS ACTION TEAM (PAT)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 32-491 **REQ COMPLETION DATE:** CLOSED

ISSUE/PROBLEM: Potential duplicate procurement status reporting systems with little or no software interface. Requires duplicate manual entry.

STATUS: OPEN: MONITOR: **CLOSED:** XXX

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: TOM GREEN

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

4/91 NWSC Crane (5025)/AMCCOM (PDM-C/DSD-PC)/NAVAIR/SPCC (Chairman)/ NOS IH (5710) - Conduct a thorough analysis of the SPCC (PPSL), NWSC Crane (2T MIPR Status), NAVAIR (Baseline), AMCCOM (Form 38/45), and SPCC (Planned Acceptance Schedule) Reports/ Data system. The intent, at a minimum, is to assure one data system can automatically trade data with another system (eliminate redundant manual entries). Report status at the next meeting.

6/91 - All of the above - Action of April 1991 remains open.

10/91 SPCC - Identify data elements which can be exchanged electronically.

11/91 SPCC - Action of October 1991 remains open.

4/92 SPCC/NSWC (402) - Establish a Tech Working Group to implement electronic data exchange between the PPSL and NSWC Crane MIPR Status Report.

4/92 PEO(T) - Determine if PMA-201 will support and participate in establishing a technical working group to implement electronic data exchange from PPSL to the NAVAIR baseline report.

4/92 AMCCOM (DS) - Determine feasibility of producing Form 38s real time. Report at next meeting.

4/92 SPCC (402)/PEO(T) - Report cost savings achieved by automation (e.g., 38 data electronically input to PPSL).

6/92 AMCCOM (DS) - Action of 4/92 remains open.

6/92 SPCC/402/PEO(T) - Report cost savings achieved by automation (e.g., form 38 data automated input to the PPSL).

8/92 SPCC - Re-look at the new form 38 to assure that all the Navy's data elements were included in the final version. It was assumed by PM4A at the last JOCG/ACQ meeting that all elements were included as DS stated they had been. Action can then be closed.

ACTION #32-491 (CONTINUED)

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

6/91 SPCC - Called a meeting 24 June 1991 at AMCCOM to review all elements of the various systems. Further analysis/comparison is required before any recommended changes can be made.

8/91 SPCC - Pulled together list of data elements. All inputs

have been received. Report next meeting.

8/91 SPCC - A list of data elements has been assembled, and inputs are being reviewed. Progress will be updated at the October team meeting.

10/91 SPCC - Have reviewed all hard copy reports and are working with NWSCC (DP) to determine which data elements of all reports can be electronically transferred between reports/activities. SPCC will provide status of review at next meeting.

4/92 SPCC - Provided results of an analysis of potential areas for electronic data exchange between PPSL, Form 38s, Crane MIPR report, and NAVAIR baseline reports. SPCC also briefed the Form 38 automation being implemented through the JOCG Acquisition Subgroup.

6/92 SPCC - SPCC is receiving form 38s electronically. SPCC will begin automatically to update the PPSL using the automated 38s approximately October 1992. POC at SPCC Craig Murphy (8513CM) AV 430-4359.

6/92 DS - Stated that no further action has been done on producing form 38s more real time.

6/92 PEO(T) - Does not intend to implement electronic data exchange from the PPSL to the NAVAIR baseline reports, but may consider automation from form 38s to NAVAIR Baseline.

8/92 AMCCOM DS - Said the Navy rep at the CIMS JLSC meeting did not need form 38s real time. The PAT group disagreed but no one knew exactly who the Navy rep had been.

8/92 SPCC - Reported that the cost avoidance associated with feeding automated form 38 data directly into the SPCC, PPSL, report was \$25k annually.

1/93 SPCC - Stated that the Form 38 did contain all the elements required by the Navy. At least all that could be provided by the SMCA. AMCCOM concurred. All agreed to close this action.

**2E/2T ACQUISITION PROCUREMENT/PRODUCTION
PROCESS ACTION TEAM (PAT)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 33-491 **REQ COMPLETION DATE:** AUG 91

STATUS: OPEN: MONITOR: **CLOSED:** XXX

ISSUE/PROBLEM: Eliminate procurement requests from the acquisition process.

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: TOM GREEN

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

4/91 SPCC - Monitor the outcome of the SPCC proposal described in the April 1991 discussion below. This may be applicable to solicitations prepared by AMCCOM in the future.

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

4/91 DISCUSSION (SPCC) - The procurement request currently provides information the contracting officer uses to prepare a solicitation. The PR and solicitation are prepared in section format, i.e., A, B, C, D, etc. The contracting officer takes the PR data and in some cases uses these data as-is to construct a solicitation. The contracting officer may have to manipulate some information before it goes into the solicitation. Since some of the information in the PR finds its way into the solicitation without any manipulation required by the contracting officer, it would seem that this presents an opportunity to save resources. I believe that the PR stage of the acquisition process is redundant, at least in part, and the PR process can be eliminated. Sections of the solicitation could be assigned to appropriate offices for these offices to fill in all or part of the information. For example Code 852 could be assigned responsibility for sections B, E, and F; and the in-service engineering activity could be assigned section C. The solicitation would be passed from office to office, or sections would be forwarded to the contracting officer. When all sections reached the contracting officer, he would review the component sections and complete the solicitation. This process could be accomplished manually or electronically.

8/91 DISCUSSION (SPCC) - SPCC Code 05 rejected proposal to eliminate procurement requests.

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 34-491 **REQ COMPLETION DATE:** FEB 93

ISSUE/PROBLEM: Delivery destinations on MIPRs.

STATUS: OPEN: **MONITOR:** CLOSED: XXX

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: TOM GREEN

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

4/91 SPCC - Put only one realistic destination on the original MIPR. Then, four to six months prior to actual delivery, amend MIPR to all final destinations, as appropriate (implement immediately).

4/91 SPCC - Monitor implementation of the above April 1991 action and provide status at the next meeting. Then provide status on a quarterly basis.

6/91 SPCC - Write a procedure defining the interface/actions necessary when destination changes are made for production due-ins. Specifically, define the WHO, WHEN, and HOW parts of the problem.

10/91 SPCC - Action of 6/91 remains open with the addition that SPCC formalize the procedure to assure management support and future continuity.

11/91 SPCC - Action of 6/91 and 10/91 remains open.

4/92 SPCC - Forward draft procedure per Action Item 6/91 to all PAT members prior to next PAT meeting.

4/92 ALL MEMBERS - Review draft SPCC procedure and provide comments at next PAT meeting.

6/92 SPCC - Identify where this action/effort fits into the original process. (Work with NSWC Crane (Code 0541RM) to incorporate.

6/92 SPCC - Report the progress of the SPCC internal PAT.

8/92 SPCC - Report the progress of the SPCC internal PAT, specifically address the status of the internal SPCC instruction to document this process.

1/93 SPCC - Continue to report the progress of the internal SPCC instruction to document the "procedures for shipping". Identify if any PAT member comments were incorporated.

1/93 ALL MEMBERS - Provide SPCC comments on their draft "procedures for shipping" which were handed out at the 1/93 PAT meeting. (Due 30 February 1993)

ACTION # 34-491 (CONTINUED)

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

4/91 SPCC - Stated there is still some confusion on what destinations to put on the original MIPRs. When the original MIPR is issued, the final destination/need for the ammo is not known but is many times still placed on the MIPR as a best guess.

If there is more than one destination, all the procurement tracking systems have to track multiple entries unnecessarily. We (SPCC/PM4) already have the policy to amend the MIPR four to six months prior to actual delivery to accommodate the most recent need. We tried putting no destination on the original MIPR, but AMCCOM (DS) had objected to this in the past.

8/91 SPCC - Formed internal SPCC PAT team to resolve MIPR delivery destinations problems. Action will be reported on at October team meeting.

10/91 SPCC - The SPCC internal PAT met to develop in-house procedures for determining delivery destinations. This effort will continue and will be reported at the next meeting.

4/92 SPCC - SPCC stated internal PAT is continuing to develop a procedure defining the interface/actions necessary when destination changes are made for production due-ins.

6/92 SPCC - Stated internal SPCC PAT has documented the process.

The PAT is brainstorming the current process to identify improvements. The SPCC Quality Improvement Council (QIC) will determine who will be tasked to write internal instructions. QIC is made up of upper management at SPCC.

8/92 SPCC - Provided the recommendations of the SPCC internal PAT along with several concerns especially for OCONUS shipments. The recommendations were; assign 1 destination on the basic MIPR except SA and Coast Guard; PR/POs assign 2 destination (1 east & 1 west coast) and issue consignee verification report monthly with training provided to SPCC personnel on how to use the report. The responsibility to write the internal ammo instruction will be made at the QIC meeting in August 1992.

1/93 SPCC - Passed out a rough draft of the "procedures for shipping" which was developed by the SPCC internal PAT. This draft will eventually be an SPCC instruction. The instruction included what the Budget Analyst, Industrial Specialist and Inventory Manager will do in the process.

4/93 SPCC - Provided the SPCC internal instruction 8000.1 of 15 April 1993. Instruction was "to provide guidance, policy and procedures for the shipment of new production for Conventional Ammunition". The PAT group agreed to close the action.

**2E/2T ACQUISITION PROCUREMENT/PRODUCTION
PROCESS ACTION TEAM (PAT)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 35-491 **REQ COMPLETION DATE:**

ISSUE/PROBLEM: FAT and LAT samples are arriving at the Test Activities without advance notice.

STATUS: OPEN: **MONITOR:** **CLOSED:** XXX

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: JOHN ABBOTT

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

4/91 AMCCOM - Investigate the proper process and where the process needs to be documented, to provide the Test Activity 30-days advance notice of FAT or LAT sample arrival. Provide details at the next meeting.

6/91 AMCCOM - Action of April 1991 remains open.

8/91 AMCCOM - Action of April 1991 remains open.

10/91 AMCCOM - Action of April 1991 remains open. AMCCOM to develop a "due-in" report.

11/91 AMCCOM - Develop monthly report for LAT/FAT test sample status to be provided to each of the Test Activities involved.

4/92 AMCCOM - Action of 11/91 remains open. Brief report format at next meeting.

4/93 AMCCOM - Provide the format for the LAT/FAT monthly BTR status report suppose to be provided to the Navy test activities. Provide test activity comments if the report satisfies their needs.

7/93 AMCCOM - Action of 4/93 remains open.

9/93 AMCCOM - Action of 4/93 remains open.

1/94 AMCCOM (PDM) - Send letter to Navy test activities asking for "priority testing list" as suggested by PDM in the 1/94 meeting. The letter will include; (1) what the test activity was to test; (2) what AMCCOM wants tested; and (3) what the test activity should expect to see coming in. Provide copy of AMCCOM letter with each test activities response to the PAT members at the next meeting.

1/94 AMCCOM (QAM) - Action of 4/93 remains open.

4/94 AMCCOM (QAM) - Action of 4/93 remains open.

4/94 AMCCOM (PDM) - Action of 1/94 remains open.

6/94 AMCCOM (PDM) - Action of 1/94 remains open.

10/94 AMCCOM (PDM) - Refine the "test activity sample delivery forecast" presented by PDM on 10/94 to include all Navy test activities. Provide it to the appropriate test activities through QAM on a monthly bases as proposed 10/94.

ACTION #35-491 (CONTINUED)

1/95 AMCCOM (PDM) - Action of 10/94 remains open.

4/95 AMCCOM (PDM) - Verify that Dahlgren (G-61) is getting the monthly production schedule as Crane (405) is currently getting. Verify that both Crane and Dahlgren will continue to get them and this action can be closed.

7/95 AMCCOM (PDM) - Action of 4/95 remains open.

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

11/91 AMCCOM - Provided point paper discussing the issue and other relative issues uncovered while talking to NWSC Crane (Code 5025), NSWC Dahlgren (G61) and NAVWPNCEN China Lake. NOS Indian Head was not contacted. The primary recommendation of the polled test activities was to provide them copies of applicable contracts. PAT members disagree with providing test activities contracts.

4/92 AMCCOM - QAM-P reported format of a monthly report for LAT/FAT test sample status is being generated.

6/92 AMCCOM - QAM-P provided the new monthly status report generated by QAM. This report lists all the Ballistic Test Reports (BTR)/scheduled test requirements for LAT/FAT. Per QAM memo to all Product Quality Managers (PQM), the PQMs are to call the test activities each month to identify changes to the BTR. BTRs were originally generated following contract award.

4/93 - Action was reopened based on action 63-492. The monthly BTR status report was not being provided to the Navy test activities as agreed too when this action was initially closed.

1/94 AMCCOM (PD) - Stated that Dahlgren and the other test activities were being provided a "priority testing list". Expect the letter to go out week of 1/17/94. The list will include; (1) what the test activity wants to test; (2) what AMCCOM wants tested; and (3) what the activity should expect to see coming in. This process is currently working with JPG and Yuma. It is unclear whether this can take the place of the QAM monthly BTR status report.

6/94 AMCCOM (QAM) - Stated that QAM had refused to provide the LAT/FAT monthly BTR status report to the Navy test activities. Workload problems. After much discussion it was decided to continue with the PDM action of 1/94 and not close the action yet. PDM agreed.

10/94 AMCCOM (PDM) - Provided a rough data sheet showing FY 95 & 96 forecasts for LAT/FAT test schedule for Crane Navy (405). Only included major cal component testing e.g. fuzes and rear fittings. PDM intends to refine this forecast to cover all Navy test activities. It will be used to notify the test activities,

ACTION #35-491 (CONTINUED)

in advance, of what test samples to expect on a monthly bases for the current year plus 1. These monthly updates will be provided through QAM.

1/95 NSWC CR (405) - Stated they had discussed getting advance notice of LAT test sample delivery with PD/QA in August 94. Code 405 has been getting, faxed from PD since Nov 94, a monthly production schedule showing only; dodic, item description, contract #, and lot #s. Crane 402 has also been giving them internal MIPR Status information via the LAN. Code (4025) reported they had checked with Dahlgren who was getting nothing on this issue.

4/95 AMCCOM (PDM) - Stated Crane (405) is still getting the production schedule as noted above 1/95. Dahlgren is not getting a schedule but will start in May 95.

2/96 IOC (SMA-DB) - Stated the IOC (SMA-DB) is now providing all Navy test activities (Crane & Dahlgren) with monthly production status schedules. The PAT all agreed to close this action.

**2E/2T ACQUISITION PROCUREMENT/PRODUCTION
PROCESS ACTION TEAM (PAT)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 36-491 **REQ COMPLETION DATE:** CLOSED

ISSUE/PROBLEM: The ISEA/CFAs do not always receive written correspondence from AMCCOM on the results of LAT.

STATUS: OPEN: MONITOR: **CLOSED:** XXX

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: BRAD SITZ

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

4/91 AMCCOM - Investigate the AMCCOM distribution/reporting process to assure LAT results are being sent to the proper ISEA/CFAs. Provide details at the next meeting.

6/91 AMCCOM - Action of April 1991 remains open.

8/91 AMCCOM - Action of April 1991 remains open.

10/91 AMCCOM - Action of April 1991 remains open.

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

4/91 DISCUSSION - NAVORDSTA does not always receive written correspondence from AMCCOM responding to Motor LAT evaluation. AMCCOM should provide written correspondence when a motor lot is placed in condition Code A, needs an RFW, or is rejected.

11/91 AMCCOM - Provided point paper as follows:

This issue seems isolated to NAVORDSTA Indian Head. The Army Missile Systems Command (MICOM) is currently responsible for funding all 2.75 inch rocket testing. MICOM does not use BTRs to initiate the transfer of funds for testing. Instead, MICOM uses a TECOM test project letter to set-up all testing, even when the test site is not a TECOM Proving Ground. Rocket motors are currently being tested at TECOM's Yuma Proving Ground. Yuma transmits the test results to their sponsor (MICOM) via the Army's DATACOM system. The distribution of this information rests with the appropriate MICOM Program Office (Hydra 70 etc.).

AMCCOM is tentatively scheduled to assume full responsibility from MICOM for all rocket procurements in the first quarter of FY-92. AMCCOM will use the BTR system in accordance with the existing SOP. The ISEA/CFAs will be listed in the remarks block for receipt of a copy of all test results in accordance with AMSMC-QA's current SOP.

ACTION #36-491 (CONTINUED)

The BTR system is working and the various ISEA's are being kept informed on the test results for their items. Action closed by PAT group.

**2E/2T ACQUISITION PROCUREMENT/PRODUCTION
PROCESS ACTION TEAM (PAT)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 38-691 **REQ COMPLETION DATE:** JAN 1993

ISSUE/PROBLEM: Gage packages/drawings require repetitive design and review. (An accepted gage package is not always re-used). Issue also includes any other gaging inconsistencies.

STATUS: OPEN: **MONITOR:** CLOSED: XXX

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: RALPH GONZALES
JOE SKOMP

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

6/91 NWAC Pomona - Call a meeting with the intent of implementing a common 2E/2T gage program to reduce repetitive gage design/review.

8/91 NWAC Pomona - Develop POA&M to compare 2T to 2E gage design/review process.

10/91 NWAC Pomona - Action of 8/91 remains open.

11/91 NWSCC (504) - Issue questionnaire to technical activities with the intent of identifying gaging inconsistencies and the methods the activities use to develop AIEs. (Target date 15 December 1991.)

11/91 NWAC Pomona - Call meeting identified in action of 6/91.

4/92 NWAC Pomona - Arrange a meeting identified in action of 6/91 with the intent of implementing a common 2E/2T gage program to reduce repetitive gage design/review.

6/92 NSWC Crane (404) - Report the results of an updated questionnaire. Original questionnaire was dated 19 December 1991.

8/92 NSWC Crane (404) - Action of 6/92 remains open.

8/92 NWAC (MS-16) - Report the results of the meeting to optimize the 2T gage program which had originally been planned for August 1992.

1/93 NSWC Crane (404) - Report the results of the revised questionnaire that was handed out to all members in the 8/92 PAT meeting.

1/93 NWAC (MS-16) - Action of 8/92 remains open.

ACTION #38-691 (CONTINUED)

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

6/91 AMCCOM - (Fritz Larson (PDM-M)) Submitted a point paper on the issue as follows: Navy TDPs, specifically bombs, require the contractor to submit a gage package for Pomona approval. In most cases approval is not received on the first submittal. Pomona has 45 days to review the package; consequently, after a few submittals a significant amount of contractual time has passed. In most cases, the contractor misses his FAT scheduled 120-150 days after contract award. Mr. Larson pointed out that since most items have been previously produced, a gage package was previously accepted. He recommended that, instead of having the contractor submit another package, the contractor should be offered the previously accepted package. The contractor could accept the entire package or re-submit a package for gages he did not elect to use; this does not apply to first-time buys.

6/91 AMCCOM (CONTINUED) - This would reduce cost, as the Government now pays each time a package is designed and submitted.

6/91 NWAC/NWSC Crane (PM4) - This problem does not exist for 2T, as once the gages are designed and built by the first contractor, the Navy takes control of the gages and provides them as GFE on future contracts.

8/91 NWAC - Reported that problem exists only for 2E.

11/91 NWAC - No action taken but it was decided to add "any other gaging inconsistencies" to the title of this issue.

4/92 NSWC Crane (404) - Reported results of 19 December 1992 questionnaire. The questionnaire showed that approximately 73 percent of the people who responded to the questionnaire do not use an AIE list.

6/92 NWAC - Reported a meeting on this issue did take place at AMCCOM on 9 June 1992. Repetitive packages is a non issue. Contractors turn in different packages and change packages mid-stream. 2T meeting set for 17 August 1992 to optimize the Program.

8/92 NSWC Crane (404) - Handed out a revised questionnaire to clarify the questions.

4/93 NWAC - Stated the 2T meeting in the 8/92 action never happened nor does it need to be. Also showed a draft Gage process being defined for 2T ammo.

4/93 NSWC Crane (404) - Reported the results of the questionnaire (10 questions) to identify gaging inconsistencies. The PAT agreed to close this action and to open a new action on defining the gage process.

**2E/2T ACQUISITION PROCUREMENT/PRODUCTION
PROCESS ACTION TEAM (PAT)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 39-691 **REQ COMPLETION DATE:** CLOSED

ISSUE/PROBLEM: Lack of Advance Procurement Plans (PP2s) on some Navy components.

STATUS: OPEN: MONITOR: **CLOSED:** XXX

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: JOE BOKSER

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

6/91 NOS IH - Investigate the problem and brief the group on the current Navy processes used and recommended fixes, if any.

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

6/91 AMCCOM - Planning documents for propellants and other components are not always provided during the budget cycle. There are certain items that the Navy buys every other year, but without planning documents AMCCOM does not know how to plan. Such items as nitrocellulose should be planned for only one year, and a realistic delivery schedule should be provided. This material has a definite shelf life and should neither be purchased nor delivered too far in advance of use. Since the material is in continuous production, there are no delivery problems, but when to bill for deliveries is difficult because there is no firm delivery schedule.

8/91 NOS IH - AMSMC-PDM-D contacted to determine actual problem.

8/91 NOS IH - Contacted AMSMC-PDM-D to determine and define problem. NOS IH suggested that Code AMSMC-PDM-D issue a "call letter" requesting the Navy and other service requirements for nitrocellulose and whatever else AMSMC-PDM-D manages. A policy letter could be written to state that requirements need to be forwarded to AMSMC-PDM-D by a certain date every year, such as we do with our PDPs. Process to be reported at next team meeting.

10/91 NOS IH - Per phoncon, AMSMC-PDM-D issue is isolated to one item, one field activity. The proposed solution is to coordinate nitrocellulose buys through the program management office at NOSIH so that accountants can bill for deliveries more effectively. Action closed.

**2E/2T ACQUISITION PROCUREMENT/PRODUCTION
PROCESS ACTION TEAM (PAT)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 40-791 **REQ COMPLETION DATE:** CLOSED

ISSUE/PROBLEM: Ill-defined/understood responsibilities relative to PDPs for SMCA procurements.

STATUS: OPEN: MONITOR: **CLOSED:** XXX

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: DON WOLVERTON

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

AMCCOM - Examine those regulations, directives, procedures, and instructions which define responsibilities relative to PDPs for SMCA procurements. Of particular concern will be those areas in which responsibilities overlap, conflict, are ambiguous, or are unidentified. A report of findings and recommendations will be furnished to the PAT.

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

8/90 - Action held open pending resolution of Action Item Number 8-690 regarding PDP format standardization.

9/90 - Mr. Wunder was unable to attend this meeting; no action reported.

10/90 - Mr. Louck provided a summary of DOD 5160.65M, Chapters 4 and 5, outlining those areas of responsibility and authority which pertain to PDPs. Each PAT member was requested to annotate this listing with the individual's code within his organization responsible for specific areas, and report back to the next meeting. A complete comparison of each of the functions will be conducted by 11 January 1991.

12/90 - Mr. Louck provided a blank form which is to be completed by the PAT and returned to Mr. Wunder by 4 January 1991. This form is designed to determine specific responsibilities for PDPs.

2/91 - Mr. Wunder provided a JOCG draft revision of Chapter 5, DOD 5160.65M. The PAT is tasked to review and provide comments to Mr. Wunder by 12 March 1991. Mr. Wolverton was tasked to provide a draft copy of the Chapter 4 revision (see enclosure (8) to the February meeting minutes), and the PAT was tasked to review and provide comments at the next meeting.

**2E/2T ACQUISITION PROCUREMENT/PRODUCTION
PROCESS ACTION TEAM (PAT)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 41-791 **REQ COMPLETION DATE:** CLOSED

ISSUE/PROBLEM: Poor inter- and intra- service communications in PDP process.

STATUS: OPEN: MONITOR: **CLOSED:** XXX

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: SCOTT RIDEOUT

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

WPNSTA Earle - Identify and evaluate the use of current lines of communication in the PDP process. Recommend improvements of these lines and/or recommend new lines of communication between the activities involved.

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

8/90 - Presented areas of commonality in the communication process. Tasked to contact AMCCOM (Ed Moore) concerning destinations of requirement in the MIPR to the necessary codes at AMCCOM. Tasked to provide specific recommendations at the next meeting.

9/90 - Each member to provide Mr. Rideout with a communications flow chart for his activity within two weeks. Mr. Rideout will then develop a master communications flow chart diagram and brief at the next PAT meeting.

10/90 - Mr. Rideout indicated he had received flow charts from each of the required activities and was working on a master chart. It was determined that the next step in this process is for each member to chart his individual activity by formal or informal lines of communication and provide the lists to Mr. Rideout prior to the next meeting. Mr. Rideout will present a consolidated matrix for review and comment. The PAT will then determine if these data are useful and worth pursuing. Areas which are marginally effective should be highlighted and suggested measurement criteria should be included.

12/90 - Mr. Rideout reported that he had received inputs from NWAC and AMCCOM but was missing NWSC Crane, PMTC and NOS IH. PAT representatives from those activities were requested to respond

to Mr. Rideout no later than 11 January 1991.

2/91 - Ms. Cullen, representing WPNSTA Earle, Code 402, presented a communications matrix for 2E/2T Cog items which had been developed from data of various activities. Minor conflicts of

ACTION #41-791 (CONTINUED)

data still exist and Mr. Rideout was tasked to contact the concerned activities which then will present a solution or recommendation to resolve the conflict at the next meeting.

4/91 - Mr. Rideout provided an updated matrix which was reviewed and changes recommended. Mr. Rideout will fax an undated version to the PAT no later than 19 April 1991 for review and will present the final version at the next meeting. The PAT was requested to resolve all remaining conflicts and provide a joint brief at the next meeting.

6/91 - Mr. Rideout presented a summary of all current alleged communication problems. Remaining issues which have not been resolved include communications between WPNSTA Earle/SPCC/PMTC/NAVSWC White Oak and NAVWPNCEN China Lake. These issues are expected to be resolved in the near future and this item was placed in monitor status.

8/91 - Developed a communications matrix; moved action item to monitor status for one year until model is validated.

11/91 WPNSTA Earle - Provided communication matrix. Action appeared to be OBE as the PAT interrelationship had forced a lot more communication in the past eighteen months. Action was closed by PAT Group.

**2E/2T ACQUISITION PROCUREMENT/PRODUCTION
PROCESS ACTION TEAM (PAT)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 42-791 **REQ COMPLETION DATE:** AUG 92

ISSUE/PROBLEM: Poor understanding of DOD Manual 5160.65M related to PDP preparation, submission, support and review.

STATUS: OPEN: MONITOR: **CLOSED:** XXX

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: CARL LOUCK

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

PMTC - Research the availability, current use, and understanding of DOD 5160.65M at the different engineering activities and the appropriate SMCA codes. Provide a summary of the responsibilities and authorities, as it applies to the PDP preparation, submission, and support for review.

11/91 NWAC (MS26)/PMTC (2041)/NWSC Crane (PM4A) - Provide all PAT 2/3 members copy of latest JOCG Subgroup Chapters. NWAC (Chapter 5, Quality Assurance), PMTC (Chapter 4, Technical Data) and NWSCC (Chapter 6, Acquisition "Draft").

11/91 ALL MEMBERS - Assure the current chapters have been published/distributed within their respective commands for proper implementation.

4/92 NWAC Pt. Mugu - Forward Chapter 4 (Tech Data) to all PAT 2/3 members.

6/92 - Action of 4/92 remains open.

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

8/90 Questionnaire prepared and distributed to PAT members. Completed questionnaires requested to Carl Louck by 1 September 1990.

9/90 - Mr. Louck reported that he had received 34 completed questionnaires. Almost all of the persons queried were familiar with the term "Single Manager"; approximately 50 percent were

familiar with DOD Manual 5160.65M; and approximately 30 percent indicated that they actually used the manual. The second part of this Action Item is due at the next meeting.

10/90 - Mr. Louck presented a summary of Chapters 4 and 5 of DOD 5160.65M. This summary is to be marked up by the PAT and submitted to Mr. Wunder as part of Action Item Number 2/690. This item was placed in monitor status at this meeting. When the revised DOD 5160.65M is published, a questionnaire will be distributed to determine progress in this area.

ACTION #42-791 (CONTINUED)

2/91 - Item was reviewed; remains in monitor status.

6/91 - Reviewed; remains in monitor status.

8/91 - Questionnaire has been prepared.

10/91 - Questionnaire will be distributed when the DOD 5160.65M is updated.

11/91 PMTC/NWSC Crane - Reported Chapters 5 (QA) and 4 (Tech Data) of DOD 5160.65M have been updated and signed. Chapter 6 (Acquisition) has all been approved but 1 page "Acquisition Strategy" but the Chapter has not been signed yet.

4/92 NWAC Pt. Mugu/NSWC Crane - Chapters 5 & 6 were made available to all PAT 2/3 members.

8/92 NSWC Crane (PM4A) - Reported that all principles of the JOCG/ACQ subgroup had signed Chapter 6 but the EXCOM had refused to forward the chapter to the JOCG until a paragraph was added on "directed delinquent MIPRS". The definition of the FDP had also changed to only include the 12 month delivery time vs the previous PAT understanding of admin + prod lead time + 12 month delivery. All other parts of Chapter 6 were not changed significantly.

8/92 AMCCOM (QAM) - Provided the latest version of Chapter 4 on Tech Data. The action was closed.

**2E/2T ACQUISITION PROCUREMENT/PRODUCTION
PROCESS ACTION TEAM (PAT)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 43-791 **REQ COMPLETION DATE:** CLOSED

STATUS: OPEN: MONITOR: **CLOSED:** XXX

ISSUE/PROBLEM: PDP format/content variation, including standard clauses.

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: AL NORRIS

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

PMTC - Review PDP format and content of all CFAs/ISEAs to determine the difference/similarities. Determine if standard clauses in the PDP conflict with MIPR and/or Army contract clauses. Provide recommendations to standardize PDP format and eliminate conflicts.

8/91 - NWSC Crane (502) will publish the requirement to use the standard PDP format within the 2T community.

10/91 - NWSC Crane (502) will report on the acceptability of the standardized PDP format.

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

8/90 - One PDP subgroup meeting previously held; Group working toward Navy PDP standardized format.

9/90 - Mr. Louck briefed the Group concerning the findings and recommendations of the Working Group. Mr. Peterson of AMCCOM was requested to find out if the "NAVAIR Single Manager Policy" letter was being used by AMCCOM. Mr. Norris of NWSCC was requested to provide the details of the MOA that NAVSEA uses for

Single Manager issues.

10/90 - Policy letter was to have been prepared jointly by NAVAIR and NAVSEA directing appropriate field activities to utilize the format developed by the PAT #2 Ad Hoc Working Group; this would be accomplished after PDP format is agreed to by the PAT.

Mr. Wolverton was requested to reconvene the Ad Hoc Working Group and either get the Group's concurrence on the standard PDP format or bring issues to the next PDP PAT meeting for resolution.

12/90 - Mr. Wolverton reported that a common PDP format had been agreed to by all members of the Ad Hoc Working Group. It was determined that a joint letter was necessary to cause implementation of the common PDP. Mr. Wolverton was requested to prepare a draft and staff it through each PAT member's field activity or command by mid-January 1991.

ACTION #43-791 (CONTINUED)

2/91 - Mr. Wolverton distributed copies of the common PDP format cover letter. The PAT was tasked to review the letter and provide comments to Mr. Wolverton by 22 February 1991.

Mr. Wolverton will staff the letter through PMA-201 and PM4 signature.

4/91 - Mr. Wolverton indicated he had received comments concerning the standardized PDP letter. After minor revisions, the package will be forwarded to Mr. Wist and Mr. Norris for staffing within all 2E & 2T cognizant engineering activities to implement these two items. The package includes the standardized PDP letter and standardized PDP change notice letter.

6/91 - Mr. Rosenthal presented a draft "standardized PDP format" implementation letter for PAT concurrence. He indicated he would ensure the letter is signed out in the near future. Mr. Wist indicated all comments had been included in the standardized PDP format and it is in staffing to other 2E Cognizance Activities. Mr. Norris indicated he anticipated the 2T Cognizance routing will start in 2 weeks.

7/91 - Mr. Rosenthal reported the PMA-201 had directed implementation of the standardized PDP and change notice procedures. Mr. Wist and Mr. Norris continue to staff the standardized PDP and change notice within the remaining 2E/2T Cognizance.

8/91 - Mr. Norris reported that 2E has standardized the 2E PDP and change notice procedures; 2T will review for concurrence.

10/91 NWSC Crane - Copy of standardized PDP format has been obtained and review is in process. Initial indications are that format is acceptable.

11/91 NWSC Crane (5025) - New PDP format is acceptable for 2T community. NWSC Crane (502) memorandum to implement is in process. Action closed by PAT Group.

**2E/2T ACQUISITION PROCUREMENT/PRODUCTION
PROCESS ACTION TEAM (PAT)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 44-791 **REQ COMPLETION DATE:** CLOSED

ISSUE/PROBLEM: Conflicting or inappropriate information in PDPs.

STATUS: OPEN: MONITOR: **CLOSED:** XXX

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: JOE SKOMP

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

NWSC Crane (5041) - Identify the reasons for conflicting or inappropriate information in PDPs. Recommend action for deleting these problems from PDP.

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

8/90 - Problem not identifiable to date. Keep open and work closely with the Action Item Group in 8-690 to see if problems are found in PDP and any recommended changes to PDP.

9/90 - This item was changed to monitor; the PAT is to continue to monitor.

10/90 - This issue remains in monitor until Action Item Number 8-690 (PAT 2) is completed.

2/91 - Item was reviewed; remains in monitor status.

6/91 - Reviewed; remains in monitor status.

8/91 - Since every PDP is different, there is no way to prove whether conflicting or inappropriate information is currently contained in the PDPs. Item will remain in monitor status until problems are identified.

10/91 - No problems have been identified. Action closed.

**2E/2T ACQUISITION PROCUREMENT/PRODUCTION
PROCESS ACTION TEAM (PAT)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER:	45-791	REQ COMPLETION DATE:	CLOSED
----------------------------	--------	-----------------------------	--------

ISSUE/PROBLEM:	Unreadable drawings.
-----------------------	----------------------

STATUS:	OPEN:	MONITOR:	CLOSED:	XXX
----------------	-------	----------	----------------	-----

ACTION ASSIGNED TO:	SARA BROWN
----------------------------	------------

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

Technical data packages (TDPs) are provided to procuring activities such as SPCC and AMCCOM libraries/repositories for retention and reproduction for distribution during the solicitation process. Illegible, unprinted, mismounted, and missing/blank aperture cards are often supplied as part of the TDPs. Activities are tasked to identify/recommend what is causing this problem.

- How many occurrences/what are percentages;
- Identify where problems occur;
- Recommend steps to solve this problem.

8/91 - AMSMC-PDM-C to continue to monitor and report to the team.

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

9/90 - A round-table discussion concerning this issue revealed the following:

- AMCCOM (Mr. Peterson) reported relatively few problems.
- NOSIH (Mr. Henry) reported only one unreadable drawing in several hundred screened.
- WPNSTA Earle (Mr. Rideout) reported no problems.
- NWSCC (Mr. Norris and Mr. Skomp) reported no problems at NWSCC. However, they indicated there may be problems at White Oak and Louisville. Mr. Louck and Mr. Skomp were to look into possible problems at White Oak and Louisville, respectively. Mr. Peterson was asked to contact the central repository at AMCCOM and inquire whether any more unreadable drawings have been found.

10/90 - Mr. Peterson indicated that the query of the AMCCOM repository revealed only a few unreadable drawings, all of which originated at NWSC Crane. He will continue to monitor; when future problems arise, the individual PAT member will be

ACTION #45-791 (CONTINUED)

notified. Mr. Peterson was requested to bring some of the unreadable drawings to the next meeting, and Mr. Taylor was requested to research SPCC and advise the PAT. Mr. Skomp was requested to canvas White Oak and Louisville. AMCCOM and SPCC representatives were asked to continue reports at each meeting.

12/90 - Mr. Peterson did not attend this meeting, but he faxed a presentation that indicated the following:

-11 ADLs reviewed from 1 September 1990 to present contained documents with problems.

-The types of problems and sources were identified, and an agreement was reached with AMCCOM repository to furnish unreadable drawings whenever they appear.

-Examples of known unreadable drawings were provided to the appropriate field activity. New data will be furnished as it becomes available.

-Issues which require resolution include the review process at the activity level regarding document quality and the use of "Best Quality Available."

-Recommendations: SPCC repository also agree to provide all problem documents as they appear. Eliminate the use of "Best Quality Available" documents.

2/91 - Mr. Peterson reported little change in status since last meeting. AMCCOM and SPCC have been tasked to return any unreadable drawings to the originator. Field activities identified as submitting poor quality or resolution. If poor quality drawings are submitted by the PFA (i.e., White Oak), the PFA will be notified by letter with a request for resolution.

4/91 - Mr. Peterson reported that a few packages had been received with unreadable drawings (nine from NWSCC and one from PMTC). Mr. Taylor indicated that, due to the pressure to get the PDPs on the street, SPCC was fixing the PDP, where possible, vice sending it back to the activity. Mr. Taylor will provide examples of these PDPs to Mr. Norris.

6/91 - Mr. Taylor indicated he had provided examples to Mr. Norris of unreadable drawings submitted from NWSC Crane. Mr. Norris indicated an in-house procedure had been established to resolve future problems of this type.

7/91 - No new information was presented at this meeting. However, this Action Item remains open in the event unreadable drawings surface during the next PDP cycle.

10/91 - No new information was presented at this meeting. Team agreed to close item, but will reopen if unreadable drawings surface during the next PDP cycle.

**2E/2T ACQUISITION PROCUREMENT/PRODUCTION
PROCESS ACTION TEAM (PAT)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 46-791 **REQ COMPLETION DATE:** JUN 92

STATUS: OPEN: MONITOR: **CLOSED:** XXX

ISSUE/PROBLEM: PDP Standard Clause in contracts.

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: TOM GREEN

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:
SPCC - Identify and evaluate standard contract clauses used by procuring agencies to implement PDP requirements.

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:
9/90 - Mr. Taylor reported that progress is ongoing, but action is not nearly complete; this Action Item entails volumes of material and requires more time to resolve. Assistance may be

required downstream.

10/90 - Mr. Taylor reported that results of Action Item Number 8-690 are required to enable continuation of this Action Item. Mr. Taylor was requested to pull the "E" Clause Section of the contracts and forward to Mr. LaPointe for Action Item Number 18-1190. Direction was to proceed with the gathering of material.

12/90 - Mr. Walt Rice replaced Mr. Taylor for this meeting. He delivered copies of clauses to the PAT. The next step is to identify conflicts between MIPR and Contract Clauses. Action is ongoing.

2/91 - Mr. Taylor presented status report indicating SPCC was still in process of evaluating contract clauses, clause restrictions, replacements, and cancellations.

4/91 - Mr. Taylor reported there were still problems. Review indicates most of the clauses can be taken care of through the CDRL process. Action to resolve this issue is slow due to reduced staffing levels at SPCC. Mr. Taylor was requested to provide a write-up on this issue at the next meeting, and the required completion date was changed to 31 December 1991.

6/91 - Mr. Taylor reported SPCC has developed a draft memorandum designed to retain certain clauses, specifically E-3 and I-29. The review process is ongoing.

7/91 - SPCC action remains ongoing concerning this issue. SPCC representative advised the group that it may be possible to complete this action sooner than 31 December 1991.

ACTION #46-791 (CONTINUED)

8/91 - SPCC is attempting to identify those clauses that should remain.

10/91 - SPCC contract services department has not distributed DOD approved clauses. Working with ammunitions contracting branch over the next two months to decide where to include necessary requirements lost through the deleted clauses.

4/92 SPCC - SPCC contract services has not distributed DOD approved clauses.

6/92 SPCC - SPCC reported that the "deletion of standard clauses in contracts" is on hold accord to NAVSUP POC. Group agreed to close the action.

**2E/2T ACQUISITION PROCUREMENT/PRODUCTION
PROCESS ACTION TEAM (PAT)**

_ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 47-791 **REQ COMPLETION DATE:** JUN 92

_ISSUE/PROBLEM: Insufficient engineering review of a PDP.

STATUS: OPEN: MONITOR: **CLOSED:** XXX

_ACTION ASSIGNED TO: JOE BOKSER

_REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

NAVAIR - Identify the processes utilized for certification and recertification of a PDP. Evaluate the processes and recommend

review requirements.

4/92 NSWCR IH - To coordinate with NSWCR Crane (Code 036RM) and incorporate PDP certification and recertification processes in the process flow chart.

4/92 NSWCR Crane (036RM) - Once incorporated, NSWCR Crane is to forward a revised process flow chart to NSWCR IH for review.

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

9/90 - Mr. Henry provided a flow chart depicting NOSIH's PDP recertification process. All remaining field activity representatives were requested to provide a chart of their own activity's PDP recertification process to Mr. Henry no later than 12 October 1990. Mr. Henry will complete and brief at the next meeting.

11/90 - Mr. Henry presented a flow chart which represented the overall PDP recertification process. It was determined that this needed to be added to the master PDP flow chart to provide a standard for the field activities to use.

12/90 - It was determined that when the standardized PDP format is approved, the overall flow chart should be revisited to ensure all current requirements are accommodated. This item was placed in monitor status.

2/91 - Item continues in monitor status.

6/91 - Reviewed; remains in monitor status.

8/91 - Reviewed; remains in monitor status.

10/91 NOSIH - No new actions taken; however, action must be taken to coordinate with Robin Meyers to incorporate PDP certification and recertification Process in the process flow chart.

11/91 NOS IH - Action of 10/91 remains in monitor status.

4/92 NSWCR IH - Provided Robin Meyers (NSWCC) with a process flow chart.

ACTION #47-791 (CONTINUED)

6/92 NSWCR Crane (0541RM) - Briefed the revised process flow chart incorporating PDP certification and recertification processes. The group agreed to close the action.

2E/2T ACQUISITION PROCUREMENT/PRODUCTION
PROCESS ACTION TEAM (PAT)

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 49-791 **REQ COMPLETION DATE:** CLOSED

ISSUE/PROBLEM: Navy Standard QA clauses.

STATUS: OPEN: MONITOR: **CLOSED:** XXX

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: JERRY LAPOINTE

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

NWAC - Develop a standard approach to Navy QA requirements which can be tailored for the commodities. Review existing and proposed Army/Navy contracts. Proposed standard QA clauses will be presented to the PAT for review/concurrence and recommended action.

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

12/90 - Mr. LaPointe presented a briefing, including a plan of action and indicated that he had contacted a number of activities in an attempt to establish a QA subgroup. The plan of action was approved by the PAT. After review of all information by the subgroup, they will select/tailor the existing and/or proposed clauses to be recommended to the PAT for further action as required.

2/91 - Mr. LaPointe reported that the QA subgroup membership has been formed. Mr. Rosenthal requested Mr. Henry Solomon be added to the membership. NWAC has forwarded a letter with the POA, existing clauses and a survey questionnaire to the QA subgroup membership. Required completion date for this item is 15 May 1991.

4/91 - Mr. LaPointe provided results of the QA subgroup questionnaire and announced a meeting of the QA subgroup to be held at AMCCOM 30 April through 1 May 1991 to review existing QA clauses and the POA. Mr. Rosenthal commented that the group should be advised that they should be prepared to resolve the issues, not just agree to disagree. Completion data for this issue is still 15 May 1991.

6/91 - Mr. LaPointe reported that the QA JOCG subgroup had met and resolved all but two issues regarding QA clauses. Mr. LaPointe indicated one more meeting was required to complete this Action Item and a new completion date of 15 August 1991 was established.

ACTION #49-791 (CONTINUED)

7/91 - Mr. LaPointe reported that very little action had taken place since the last report. The two issues cited above are still open for resolution.

8/91 - No action reported.

10/91 - NWAC contacted SPCC to determine the deposition of the SPCC SPC clause and the SPCC E.3 production lot acceptance

clause. SPCC has yet to reply. Disposition of the two clauses cited above is still open for resolution.

11/91 NWAC - Presented the history of the QA clauses in a synopsis paper starting with the 30 April 1991 meeting at AMCCOM.

All QA issues have been resolved. The MOU on SPC was signed and Chapter 5 of DOD 5160.65M has also been signed in October 1991. Action closed by PAT group.

**2E/2T ACQUISITION PROCUREMENT/PRODUCTION
PROCESS ACTION TEAM (PAT)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 51-791 **REQ COMPLETION DATE:** JAN/MAY 94

ISSUE/PROBLEM: Inadequacy of PDP review guidance.

STATUS: **OPEN:** **MONITOR:** **CLOSED:** XXX

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: SCOTT RIDEOUT
 DOUG SMITH

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

7/91 NAVAIR - Identify shortcomings of current PDP review guidance. Recommend guidance for performing an adequate PDP review using the standardized PDP format.

10/91 NOS IH - Develop a guidance package which will be reviewed and revised at the next meeting.

10/91 WPNSTA Earle - With the assistance of AMCCOM (QAM-I), develop a PDP review guidance package/check list to assure the adequacy of the PDP before it is signed out. Brief check list at next meeting for further review by all members.

4/92 WPNSTA Earle - To forward the check list to NSWCC, NAWC Pt. Mugu, NSWC IH, and AMCCOM (AMSMC-QAM-P).

6/92 WPNSTA Earle - Brief the final check list at the next meeting.

6/92 ALL MEMBERS - DTA provide "check list" comments back to Earle by 31 July 1992.

8/92 WPNSTA Earle - Chair a working group to finalize the PDP checklist to assure the adequacy of a PDP. The group should include NSWCC 402, 404, PMTC 4021, IH 570D and AMCCOM BAT. Report the final list at the next meeting to close this action.

1/93 WPNSTA Earle - Action of 8/92 remains open. In addition, the Working Group should address the issue of not assigning PDP numbers, briefed by NSWC Crane (402(Steve Thomas)) on 1/93.

4/93 AMCCOM (PD) - In January of each year (e.g. January 1994), provide to the DTAs a copy of the open PWD register which will identify the planning PRONS for the next FY procurements (e.g. FY 95). These PRONS can then be put on the PDPs submitted by the DTAs.

4/93 All TECHNICAL ACTIVITIES - Provide Earle a copy/example of an FY 94 PDP (Due 15 May 1993).

4/93 WPNSTA Earle - Brief the status of this issue at the next meeting. Specifically identify efforts that can be taken to standardize ADLs.

ACTION #51-791 (CONTINUED)

7/93 ALL TECHNICAL ACTIVITIES - Action of 4/93 remains open

except for Crane 402.

7/93 WPNSTA Earle - Action of 4/93 remains open.

7/93 AMCCOM (PDM) - Action of 4/93 remains open (due January 1994).

9/93 WPNSTA Earle - Chair a working group to standardize what goes into the ADL and other elements of the standard PDP (target due date May 1994).

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

7/91 - Mr. Henry indicated a questionnaire was in development for distribution to the CFAs, requesting problem identification NLT 2 August 1991. The data will be used to develop a guidance package which will be reviewed and revised at the next meeting. A proposed completion date of 30 September 1991 was established.

8/91 - Questionnaire will be distributed to all team members.

10/91 NOS IH - Questionnaire requesting problem identification from the following activities: PMTC, NAC, NWSC (502, 504, 705), NOSIH, WPNSTA Earle, AIR-540, NMWEA. The data will be used to develop a guidance package which will be reviewed and revised at the next meeting.

4/92 WPNSTA Earle - Check list was forwarded but not received by all PAT 2/3 members. Data provided by team member reviews will be used to develop a guidance package/check list to assure the adequacy of a PDP before it is signed out.

6/92 WPNSTA Earle - Earle forwarded the check list to all DTAs June 1992. Awaiting response for compilation. Also, provided copies of the check list at the June 1992 meeting.

8/92 WPNSTA Earle - Handed out the old check list with an * noting the requested changes to the check list by the responding activities. Approximately 50% of the items had an * but yet only NSWCR Crane (402) and NSWCR Indian Head (570D) had responded to date.

4/93 WPNSTA Earle - Held a working group at PMTC in February 1993. The PDP checklist was finalized and all the working group agreed that no PDP # was needed. The working group recommended that a Navy wide instruction to define/prepare ADLs was needed. They also identified that PRONS are not sent on PDPs since they are not provided by AMCCOM in all cases e.g. 2T. Also identified a need to track ADL revisions in contracts.

7/93 WPNSTA Earle - Only received a copy/example of an FY 94 PDP from Crane 402.

9/93 WPNSTA Earle - Stated that all technical agents had provided them a copy/example of a PDP except Indian Head (570D).

ACTION #51-791 (CONTINUED)

1/94 WPNSTA Earle - Stated no working group had been chaired by Earle per 9/93 action. After a lengthy discussion the PAT members agreed to close this action since all agreed the elements within the standard PDP did not need to be standardized within themselves.

**2E/2T ACQUISITION PROCUREMENT/PRODUCTION
PROCESS ACTION TEAM (PAT)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 53-891 **REQ COMPLETION DATE:** JUN 93

ISSUE/PROBLEM: The inability to provide GFM to support breakout procurements highlighted the need to improve management of components.

STATUS: OPEN: **MONITOR:** CLOSED: XXX

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: J. WILDRIDGE

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

8/91 - Document the present system for managing components, and propose appropriate actions. Identify process, reservation of components, and accountability of components.

10/91 NSWSC Crane - With PM4A assistance, identify the method of measuring whether the system/process is working.

11/91 NSWSC Crane - Action of 10/91 remains open.

4/92 NSWSC Crane - Action placed in monitor status. NSWCC to monitor effectiveness of Ammunition Component Tracking System (ACTS) toward improving the management of components.

6/92 NSWSC Crane - Action of 4/92 remains open.

8/92 NSWSC Crane - Action of 4/92 remains open.

1/93 NSWSC Crane (402) - Continue to monitor the effectiveness of the ACTS system. Try to estimate how much of the reported components usage is due to the establishment of ACTS and would not have been used otherwise.

4/93 NSWSC Crane (402) - Action of 1/93 remains open.

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

10/91 NSWSC Crane - Process has been identified and efforts are underway to incorporate requirements in the acquisition process.

4/92 NSWSC Crane - ACTS for 2T ammo has been established. The system was briefed and copies of the program (discs) were passed out.

6/92 NSWSC Crane - Report some of the initial effectiveness of the ACTS effort. \$10M worth of components are being used from the inventory during FY-94 Reno & Prod.

1/93 NSWSC Crane (402) - Reported \$43.7M worth of components have been used in the 2T program. Exactly how much of this would have been used prior to ACTS is unknown but much better visibility and control is maintained with ACTS. Several problems were identified: inventory changes e.g. Condition Code and Purpose

ACTION #53-891 (CONTINUED)

Code, lag time between CAIMS reports and obligation request and unanticipated changes to the CAIMS data format. Other than that the system is working good.

4/93 NSWC Crane - Reported the 402 item managers are using ACTS for inventory info and obligations. There are currently 30 users. NSWC has had good rapport with SPCC as they notify NSWC if they receive an obligation request on 2T ammo that hasn't been processed through ACTS. Code 402 has a preliminary plan for identifying component inventories that are candidates for demil.

7/93 NSWC Crane - Discussed the 402 use of the ACTs system and associated/potential cost avoidances. Also discussed the old method of operation vs the new method of tracking components which no longer ignores in-service components. Estimated cost avoidance was \$1.3 mil which was on the extreme conservative side. The group agreed to close this action.

**2E/2T ACQUISITION STANDING WORKING GROUP
(SWG)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 54-1091 **REQ COMPLETION DATE:**

ISSUE/PROBLEM: Performance measurement: Number of Contractor CM/DM Actions including recurring RFD/RFWs. (Contractor generated only).

STATUS: OPEN: **MONITOR:** CLOSED: XXX

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: STEVE THOMAS
CARL LOUCK

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

10/91 WPNSTA Earle - (1) Determine concise definition of performance measurement. (2) Propose factors/items for measurement. (3) Provide statistical data on the number of Contractor CM/DM Actions including recurring RFD/RFWs.

11/91 WPNSTA Earle - Develop a data collection form with definitions of all data elements to be collected. (No later than 15 December 1991). Forward form to all technical agent members of PAT to fill in data.

11/91 NOS IH (5710, 511)/NSWC Crane (504,5025)/PMTc (2063) - Forward completed data collection forms (provided by WPNSTA Earle) back to Earle by 20 January 1992. Future quarterly submits are required 3 weeks prior to each quarterly PAT meeting.

4/92 WPNSTA Earle - Resubmit data collection forms per action of 11/91 with revised definitions of all data elements to be collected. Contact AMCCOM for contractor/producer generated actions to supplement this effort.

4/92 NSWC IH/NSWC Crane/and NAWC Pt. Mugu - Forward completed data collection forms to WPNSTA Earle.

6/92 WPNSTA Earle & OTHERS - Action of 4/92 remains open.

8/92 WPNSTA Earle - Continue to collect data and brief at the next meeting.

8/92 SPCC - Provide Earle the number of active MIPRs and NIINs by commodity.

1/93 WPNSTA Earle - Continue to collect data and brief at the next meeting. Put out a data call letter prior to the next meeting to assure all activities are reminded and respond.

4/93 WPNSTA Earle - Continue to collect data and brief at the

next meeting. Change the denominator to the "# of end item

ACTION # 54-1091 (CONTINUED)

contracts" vs all contracts as given previously. Also add government generated CM/DM actions to this action.

7/93 WPNSTA Earle - Action of 4/93 remains open.

9/93 WPNSTA Earle - Continue to collect data and brief at the next meeting.

1/94 PMTC (P2609)/NSWC (402,404)/Earle - For your activities cog items, analyze why the ECPs, RFDs, CLAs, RFWs and RCUs were made.

Only review FY 92 and forward procurements/MIPRs. NSWC (402) take the lead and categorize the reasons why so all activities can present similar data at the next meeting.

4/94 PMTC - Review the Crane (402) change request/notice categories presented at the 4/94 meeting. Provide comments to Crane (402) by 30 Apr 94.

4/94 PMTC (P2609)/NSWC (402)/Earle - For your activities cog items, analyze why the ECPs, RFDs, CLAs, RFWs and RCUs were made.

Only review a sample of FY 92 and forward procurements/MIPRs. Present data using the categories/reasons provided by NSWC (402) during the 4/94 meeting.

6/94 PMTC - Review the Crane (402) change request/notice categories presented at the 4/94 meeting. Provide comments to Crane (402) by 30 Jul 94.

6/94 PMTC (P2603)/Earle - For your activities cog items, analyze why the ECPs, RFDs, CLAs, RFWs and RCUs were made. Only review a sample of FY 92 and forward procurements/MIPRs. Present data using the categories/reasons provided by NSWC (402) during the 4/94 meeting.

10/94 NSWC Crane (402) - For all 2T cog items, from October 94 forward, collect data categorizing the reasons why ECPS, RFDS,CLAs and RCUs were made into the 5 categories presented 4/94. Present summarized data quarterly to the PAT.

10/94 NAWC (P260) - For all 2E bombs, from October 94 forward, collect data categorizing the reasons why ECPS, RFDS,CLAs and RCUs were made into the 5 categories presented 4/94. Present summarized data quarterly to the PAT.

1/95 NSWC Crane (402) - For all 2T cog items, collect data categorizing the reasons why ECPS, RFDS,CLAs and RCUs were made into the 6 categories presented 1/95 (I-VI). Present summarized data quarterly to the PAT.

1/95 NAWC (P2603) - For all 2E bombs, collect data categorizing the reasons why ECPS, RFDS,CLAs and RCUs were made into the 6 categories presented 1/95 (I-VI). Present summarized data

quarterly to the PAT.

ACTION # 54-1091 (CONTINUED)

4/95 NSWSC Crane (402)/NAWC (P2603A) - Both actions of 1/95 remain open.

7/95 NSWSC Crane (402) /NAWC (110000E) - Continue to collect data as stated in action of 1/95.

2/96 NSWSC Crane (402) /NAWC (110000E) - Continue to collect data as stated in action of 1/95. Note the discussion in 2/96 action taken about reducing the categories to 2-3.

6/96 NSWSC Crane (4025) - For all 2T cog items, collect data categorizing the reasons why ECPS, RFDS, CLAs and RCUs were made into the 4 categories presented 6/96 (I-IV). Present summarized data quarterly to the PAT.

6/96 NAWC (P2603) - For all 2E bombs, collect data categorizing the reasons why ECPS, RFDS, CLAs and RCUs were made into the 4 categories presented 6/96 (I-IV) by 4025. Present summarized data quarterly to the PAT.

10/96 NACE (110000E) - Action of 6/96 remains open.

10/96 NSWSC Crane (4025) - Continue to collect all 2T data as stated in the 6/96 action.

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

11/91 WPNSTA Earle - Provided brief sheet requesting point of contact for each commodity to provide to WPNSTA Earle the following information by quarter: 1) number of contracts, 2) number of ECPs, 3) number of Waivers, 4) number of Deviations, 5) number of Clarification Requests and 6) number of recurring requests.

4/92 WPNSTA Earle - Discussed information received from PAT 2/3 members. However, team members misinterpreted information being requested.

8/92 WPNSTA Earle - Provided data showing the FY-92 ECP, RFD, RFW, CLARIFICATIONS and recurring changes by quarter.

1/93 SPCC - Provided the number of active MIPRs and NIINs by

commodity which was passed out at the meeting. (453 MIPRs and 209 NIINs)

1/93 WPNSTA Earle - Provided data showing FY 92 ECPs, RFDs, RFWs, clarifications and recurring changes by quarter. No data was provided by PMTC yet.

ACTION # 54-1091 (CONTINUED)

4/93 WPNSTA Earle - Provided FY 92 and ½ of FY 93 ECPs/RFDs/Clarifications/RFWs/RCUs data. The ECP data (35-56% of all contracts had an ECP) was extremely high and appeared to be in error. The # of component contracts was discussed as a problem as this data was not available or at best inaccurate and the group decided to use AUR contracts as the denominator for the next brief. The group also decided to add government generated CM/DM actions to this issue.

9/93 WPNSTA Earle - Briefed the ECP, RFD, CLA, RFW and RCUs for FY 92 and 3/4 of FY 93.

1/94 Earle - Provided the ECP, RFD, CLA, RFW and RCUs for all of FY 92 and 93. Earle recommended to close the action because of some data gathering problems/errors but the group decided to have the tech activities analyze the reasons for the ECPs and etc instead.

4/94 NSWC Crane (402) - Provided the change request/notice categories they had generated using 76MM as an example. The reasons were put into 5 categories: issued to correct ADLs (I); issued to implement desired changes which enhance procurement success (prevent delays, reduce cost or improve items)(II); to implement new requirements to meet policy or regulation changes (III); to implement optional changes e.g. accommodate producer's desired production method (IV); and those not implemented or approved (V). For 12 FY 92 76MM ADLs there were 18 # (I)s, 10 # (II)s, 6 # (III)s, 10 # (IV)s and 11 # (V)s.

10/94 NAWC (P2603) - Selected the BDU-45/B 500 lb bomb as the candidate to analyze into the 5 change request/notice categories stated above 4/94. Looked at all changes for FY 91 through FY 94. 65% of all the actions/changes were in category IV (to implement optional changes e.g. accommodate producer's desired production method).

10/94 Earle - Reviewed a sample of the FY 93 procurements and placed the reasons for actions/changes into the 5 categories. No unusual problems were noted. Had sampled MK 79-0 pallet adapter, CNO-405 container, MK 14-3 cart tank, MK 16-0 and MK 11-2 pallet adapters.

10/94 NSWC Crane (402) - Presented data and stated they had been watching, since 1 July 94, and would continue to watch 100% of 4025 responsible items (2T major cal) for change request/notice categories. They expect to collect data on all 2T items in the future.

ACTION # 54-1091 (CONTINUED)

1/95 NSWC CR (402) - Reiterated the categories of change request I through IV. Presented FY 89-94 2T (major caliber only), change request/notices (data is back to Jul 94). Also addressed the 44 2T CNs for third Qtr FY 94 that IMSD had mentioned in action #18. Eight were countermeasures, 18 were flex linear shaped charges, 8 of the remaining 18 were category I (TDP deficiencies). IMSD is still making MIPR amendments for CNs but were not supposed to per action #80. IMSD agreed to stop.

1/95 NAWC (P2603) - Proposed a new category, type VI = change requests/notices issued to implement PIP. A. major PIP, B. design change in response to engineering investigation, C. new technology and D. improved manufacturing process.

4/95 NSWC CR (4025) - Provided FY 89-94 data for 2T major cal only. For FY 92-94, presented the number of ADLs signed (about 53/year) compared to the number with type I changes (about 3/YR).

7/95 NSWC CR (4025) - Provided FY 89-94 data for 2T major cal and pyro/demo. OSGA and SA virtually have none or very few Navy TDPs, therefore, they were left out. Presented category or type I through VI changes as follows;

I = correct ADL & associated dwgs & specs;

II = implement changes which enhance procurement success;

III = implement new requirements - policy or regulatory changes;

IV = implement optional changes - producer driven

V = disapproved; VI = implement PIP

Trends with in the types of changes had not been determined yet.

2/96 NSWC CR (4025) - Provided FY 89-95 data for 2T major cal and pyro/demo. Change request & notice categories were the same as presented 7/95. They wanted to eliminate collection of all categories except type I "change requests/notices to correct ADL" since it shows where the engineering agent truly messed up. PMTC and NSWC (402) decided to revisit the categories again and maybe reduce to maybe 2-3 categories.

6/96 NSWC CR (4025) - Provide FY 90-96 data for 2T major cal and pyro/demo. Changed the types of change requests & notices from 6 to 4. They are:

Type I = Navy errors, or our screw ups

Type II = Contractor errors

Type III = Others; Type IV = Disapproved

10/96 NSWC CR (4027) - Provided FY 90-96 data for 2T major cal and pyro/demo. % of changes which were Type I through IV was presented by FY.

3/97 NSWCR (4025) - Provided FY 90 - 96 data for 2T major cal and pyro/demo. Total changes by type, year were presented. Types were the same as in 6/96 action taken.

3/97 ALL - The Standing Working Group, formally the PAT, decided to close this action. The QMB has evolved into more of a tiger team concept and no longer wanted indicators. We decided to no longer operate as a PAT but rather a Standing Working Group with more formal information/issue briefs and work the hot issues.

**2E/2T ACQUISITION STANDING WORKING GROUP
(SWG)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 55-1091 **REQ COMPLETION DATE:**

ISSUE/PROBLEM: Performance measurement: Number of solicitations with unacceptable changes.

STATUS: OPEN: **MONITOR:** CLOSED: XXX

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: CARL LOUCK

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

10/91 PMTC - (1) Determine concise definition of performance measurement. (2) Propose factors/items for measurement. (3) Provide statistical data on the number of solicitations with unacceptable changes.

11/91 AMCCOM (QAM-I) - Attempt to get 10 additional FY-91 contracts/solicitations and 10 FY-92 solicitations and forward them to the appropriate Technical Agent for review. Note on all the forwarding data that the unacceptable changes are to be identified and data forwarded to PMTC per PMTC form of 11/91 (reference this action item). The 20 contracts/solicitations should be for 2T (NSWC Crane(5025)) and/or 2E (NSWC Crane(504)) items so a broader representation of data can be provided.

11/91 PMTC - Continue to collect data and brief on a quarterly basis.

4/92 NAWC Pt. Mugu - Collect data from NSWCR IH, NSWCC, and WPNSTA Earle focusing on unacceptable unilateral changes on those solicitations/contracts they support. Brief data on a quarterly basis.

4/92 AMCCOM (PD/DS/QAM-I) - Take NAWC Pt. Mugu data provided on 4/92 to PC and try to resolve:

(A)Where/why are the MIPR clauses dying prior to solicitation.

(B)Why are solicitations not being sent to Navy tech agent.

6/92 PMTC - Action of 4/92 remains open.

8/92 NAWC Pt. Mugu - Collect data from NSWCR Indian Head, NSWCR Crane and WPNSTA Earle focusing on unacceptable changes on those solicitations/contracts they support. Brief data on a quarterly basis.

8/92 NSWC Crane (PM4) - Call AMCCOM (DS) and reemphasize the need

ACTION #55-1091 (CONTINUED)

for the internal AMCCOM PAT between PD, PC, DS, QAM and BAT to review the process within AMCCOM to assure MIPR clauses, PDP requirements, distribution requirements and related issues are being complied with on Navy MIPRs.

1/93 AMCCOM (DSS) - Establish an AMCCOM internal PAT between PD, PC, DS, QAM and BAT, to review the process within AMCCOM. The intent is to assure MIPR clauses, PDP requirements, distribution requirements and related issues are being complied with on Navy MIPRs. (AMCCOM internal PAT action moved to action 78-493).

1/93 NAWC Pt. Mugu - Continue to report data on a quarterly basis.

4/93 NAWC PMTC - Continue to report data on a quarterly basis.

7/93 PMTC - Continued to report data on a quarterly basis.

7/93 NSWC Crane (402) - Sample 2T solicitations/contracts (qty of 7 to 10 items) and analyze for unacceptable changes similar to PMTC data for 2E. Present findings at next meeting.

9/93 PMTC - Action of 7/93 remains open.

9/93 AMCCOM (DSS)/NVLNO - Address the unacceptable changes/errors on solicitations with QAM and PAA as to what can be done to fix the problem before the solicitation goes out. Use the four 2T items presented by Crane (402) on 9/93 as examples. Report results/actions being taken at next meeting.

1/94 PMTC - Continue to report the number of 2E solicitations/contracts with unacceptable changes. Chart/demonstrate the progress which is believed to have been made toward resolving these unacceptable changes since this issue was first presented to the PAT.

4/94 PMTC - Action of 1/94 remains open to chart/demonstrate the progress. The PAT will then only re-sample every 6 months.

6/94 PMTC - Action of 4/94 remains open.

10/94 NAWC (P2603) - Continue to provide summarized data charting/demonstrating the progress being made in the number of solicitations with unacceptable changes.

1/95 NAWC (P2603) - Action of 10/94 remains open. (Due Nov 95, and then on an annual basis)

2/96 NAWC (110000E) - Continue to provide summarized data charting/demonstrating the progress being made in the number of solicitations with unacceptable changes. (Due again JAN 97)

2/96 IOC (IOE-A)/(ACC-F) - Investigate the causes for the continual CDRL errors on solicitations for Navy items, reported by NAWC on 1/94, 10/94 and again 2/96. Identify any process

changes which can be or are being made to fix the problem.
6/96 NAWC (110000E) - Action of 2/96 remains open (Due Jan 97)
6/96 IOC (IOE-A)/ (ACC-F) - Action of 2/96 remains open.
(Due Nov 96)

ACTION #55-1091 (CONTINUED)

10/96 NAWC (110000E) - Action of 2/96 remains open. Also work with the IOC Engineering group, formerly BAT, to investigate the causes for the continual CDRL errors on solicitations for Navy items, reported by NAWC on 1/94, 10/94 and again 2/96. Identify any process changes which can be or are being made to fix the problem.

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

11/91 PMTC - Provided data collected on 10 FY-91 solicitations/contracts on 2E ammunition. Nine contracts had unacceptable changes. A total of 73 unacceptable changes were noted on which 55 were CDRLs. Also provided a data collection form.

4/92 NAWC Pt. Mugu - Provided solicitations/contracts with unacceptable unilateral changes from NAWC Pt. Mugu. Of the 14 FY-91/92 solicitations/contracts reviewed, 100% contained unacceptable unilateral changes.

6/92 NSWC Crane (PM4A)/SPCC/AMCCOM - Discussed their meeting at AMCCOM in May 1992 and the commitments by AMCCOM (DS) to try to form a PAT or etc. (with PD, PC, QA, DS and BAT). Intent is to review the whole process within AMCCOM to assure MIPR clauses, PDP, distribution requirements, etc., for the services are being complied with.

Action (PD) - Report the progress of the AMCCOM internal PAT (PD, PC, QA, DS, and BAT) to resolve the MIPR clauses, solicitations, distribution and various other related actions.

PMTC - Determine ways the Navy receiving MIPR changes and etc. feedback. (How do we track performance).

8/92 AMCCOM (PD) - Reported that PD will identify on the PRONS that the PRONS are "Navy Special" to try to assure the clauses and etc. are being implemented. This will be done on the FY-93 procurements.

8/92 AMCCOM (DS) - Stated that DS had not organized an internal AMCCOM PAT yet.

1/93 NSW Crane (PM4) - Chairman stated that he did call AMCCOM (DS) to assure the AMCCOM internal PAT was set up. DS (J. M.) stated they were working the issues that PM4A and SPCC had identified to him but they were not going to establish a PAT. Doug (DSS) said he would take this for action and report what was being done at the next meeting.

ACTION #55-1091 (CONTINUED)

1/93 PMTC - Briefed the group on the number of solicitations/contracts with unacceptable changes on bombs only. Eight solicitations/contracts were reviewed of which seven contained unacceptable changes.

4/93 PMTC- Provided data showing 7 of 8 contracts reviewed had unacceptable changes for FY 92. For FY 93 it was 1 of 3.

7/93 PMTC- Provided data showing 9 of 11 2E contracts/solicitations reviewed had unacceptable changes for FY 92. Also 5 of 7 for FY 93. Most changes where CDRLS.

9/93 NSW Crane (402) - Briefed the results of four 2T items selected for solicitations with unacceptable changes/errors. The items were projectile body, poly plug, prox. fuze and an IR fuze. Numerous problems were noted many of which were serious.

1/94 PMTC - Provided 2E bomb solicitations/contracts with unacceptable changes. PMTC noted improvements are being made to reduce the unacceptable changes and AMCCOM is taking action on errors when PMTC notifies them.

1/94 AMCCOM (DSS/PAA) - Had reviewed the four 2T items with unacceptable changes. Typing errors and data not being filled in by the contract specialist were the main reasons. No intentional errors were noted. All the other codes in AMCCOM who review the documents also missed the errors. The PAT discussed maybe making a computer system change to check for errors or maybe the PD director issuing a memo to reemphasize the need for accuracy on solicitations/contracts. No future action from AMCCOM could be decided on by the group at this time.

10/94 NAWC (P2603) - Provided summarized charts showing 1991 through 1993, 2E bombs and ammo, solicitations with unacceptable changes. Trends are definitely improving in all areas except CDRL changes/errors e.g. approval authority code changes, admin, typographical errors and a few CDRL requirements being omitted.

2/96 NAWC (110000E) - Provided summarized charts showing 1991 through 1996, 2E bombs and ammo, solicitations with unacceptable changes. CDRL changes/errors are still the only problem areas similar to those stated 10/94 above. Corrections were sent back to the IOC and who the fixed the errors.

10/96 IOC (IOE-A) - Provided a written note stating, Product Quality Managers do not receive a copy of Navy CDRLS. They don't change Navy submissions but do use CDRLs which have been accepted by agreement and convention on previous production efforts. the only change IOE-A expects the IOC would make involves the

approval authority block. IOE-A will list itself as the approval authority for QA and SPC plans. As in the past, input from the Navy would be solicited and included in comment/approval process. 3/97 ALL - The Standing Working Group, formally the PAT, decided to close this action. The QMB has evolved into more of a tiger team concept & indicators are needed. We decided to not operate as a PAT but rather as a Standing Working Group with more formal information/issue briefs and work the hot issues as they arise.

**2E/2T ACQUISITION STANDING WORKING GROUP
(SWG)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 56-1091 **REQ COMPLETION DATE:**

ISSUE/PROBLEM: Performance measurement: Number of exceptions/changes from PDP review.

STATUS: OPEN: **MONITOR:** CLOSED: XXX

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: STEVE THOMAS
 CARL LOUCK

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

10/91 PMTC - (1) Determine concise definition of performance measurement. (2) Propose factors/items for measurement. (3) Provide statistical data on the number of exceptions/changes from PDP review.

11/91 - Action of 10/91 remains open.

4/92 NSWC Crane - Continue to collect and analyze data (include FY-93).

6/92 - Action of 4/92 remains open.

8/92 NSWC Crane - Continue to collect and analyze data. Assure all data elements are defined and the definitions are provided to all activities to assure consistency in the data provided. Definitions should also be provided as a part of each brief to the PAT.

1/93 NSWC Crane (404) - Action of 8/92 remains open.

4/93 NSWC Crane (404) - Continue to collect and provide summarized data. Definitions of the data elements should be provided as a part of each brief to the PAT.

7/93 NSWC Crane (404) - Continue to provide summarized data on quarterly basis.

7/93 NSWC Crane (402)/PMTC (P2609)/WPNSTA Earle - Sample 5 worst candidates (most exceptions) from your cognizant ammo and brief the group as to the reasons for these exceptions.

9/93 NSWC Crane (404) - Continue to provide summarized data on an annual basis. Next target date August 1994.

1/94 NSWC Crane (404) - Action of 9/93 remains open with a target date to present in Aug 1994.

4/94 NSWC Crane (402) - Take over (404) action of 9/93 with a target date to present data Sep 1994.

10/94 NSWC Crane (402)/ NAWC (P2603)/ Yorktown (9320) - Jointly

ACTION #56-1091 (CONTINUED)

decide what data needs to be collected to address this action item. Determine how to collect data, who will collect it and how often we need it presented to the PAT. Present results at the next PAT meeting.

1/95 NAWC (P2603) - Continue to collect 2E (bomb & ammo) data as presented 1/95.

1/95 NSWC CR (4025) - Provide sample data from each (5"/54, 76MM, and Pyro/demo) in the same format as presented by NAWC on 1/95.

4/95 NAWC (P2603) - Continue to collect 2E (bomb & ammo) data as presented 1/95.

4/95 NSWC CR (4025) - Provide sample data from each (5"/54, 76MM, and Pyro/demo) in the same format presented 4/95.

7/95 NSWC CR (4025) - Provide sample data from each (5"/54, 76MM, and Pyro/demo) in the same format presented 7/95. Make sure Pyro/Demo is included.

7/95 NAWC (110000E) - Action of 4/95 remains open.

2/96 NSWC CR (4025) - Provide sample data from each (5"/54 & 76MM) in the same format presented 2/96.

2/96 NAWC (110000E) - Continue to collect 2E (bomb & ammo) data as presented 1/95.

6/96 NSWC CR (4025) - Provide data for (5"/54 & 76MM) in the same format presented 2/96.

6/96 NAWC (110000E) - Provide data for 2E (bombs & ammo) as presented 1/95.

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

4/92 NSWC Crane - Provided proposed factors/items for measurement and statistical data on the number of exceptions/changes from PDP review (# items, drawings, exceptions and NORs). Based upon data collected for FY-91 and FY-92 there appears a trend that the average number of exceptions per configuration identification is decreasing.

8/92 NSWC Crane - Provided FY-91 through FY-93 data showing the number of items, drawings, exceptions and NORs. Data was also split by technical activity.

4/93 NSWC Crane - Provided a brief with trends on the # of drawings; exceptions; NORs; and configurations for FY 91 through 93. All Technical Agent's data was identified separately.

7/93 NSWC Crane (404) - Provided some data for FY 91 through 94. The number of exceptions went up drastically in FY 94 (1275

total). There was some disagreement on how the data was collected. Some of the prior year 2T data that was provided was in error per 402. The data elements being collected had been further defined by Earle and sent out to the other Technical Activities.

ACTION #56-1091 (CONTINUED)

9/93 WPNSTA Earle - Stated the worst offenders for exceptions were Navy ADLs for Picatinny drawing packages e.g PA 156/157 ammo boxes. All changes must be made by ADL change. The next 4 offenders were less than 1 month notice from PMTC mandates all changes by ADL exception.

9/93 NSWC Crane (404) - Presented FY 92-94 data on; conf ident, # dwgs/specs, # exceptions, # exceptions removed by NOR, # exceptions added by review, total # NORs and then exceptions remaining. All tech agents were identified separately. The group decided to only report this data annually.

9/93 NSWC Crane (402) - Presented 5 items which had been reviewed for ADL exceptions, projectile body, poly plug, ammo box and 2 fuzes. Exceptions were defined as admin, technical and tailored.

1/94 NSWC Crane (404) - Provided FY 92 -94 data showing the # of items, drawings, exceptions and NORs. Data was also split by technical activity.

10/94 NSWC Crane (402) - Had taken over the action form 404 as 402/404 are now combined at Crane. Presented FY 95 PDP information only. They stated past and current data is not presenting the true picture e.g. not all ECPs are accounted for because they were on last years PDPs. Suggested 2T DAs provide quarterly reports to specify the # of ADL exceptions obsoleted due to tech data update. Suggested 4025 can assist 2T DAs in tabulating the number of exceptions until DAs gain familiarity with ACMDs. Also suggested exceptions be categorized.

10/94 NAWC (P2603) - Proposed a new way of collecting data for this action with the following column:

commodity, # of drawings/specs, total # of exceptions (including change notices), # of exceptions incorporated into PDP by NORs, # of NORs/SCNs utilized, total # of NORs (FY), exceptions remaining and the # of exceptions the same as previous PDP. Some how these columns were to be collected by FY of the contract year.

1/95 NAWC (P2603) - Provided FY 91-94 data for 2E bombs using the following columns of data; PDP commodity and FY, # of dwgs and specs, # of exceptions (dwgs,specs,other), # of exceptions incorporated, # of NORs/SCNs utilized, total # of (NORs,SCNs), # of exceptions remaining, and # of exceptions same as previous PDP. Proposed the measurement indicators provided by this data are; total number of exceptions & NORs for each FY; total number of exceptions & NORs for each FY compared to qty of ADLs; % of exceptions incorporated by NORs for each FY; number of exceptions not incorporated by NORs, number carried over to the

next procurement ADL for each FY; and number of exceptions not incorporated FY compared to the quantities of ADLs.

ACTION #56-1091 (CONTINUED)

1/95 NSWCR (4025) - Provided 76MM exception data similar to what they provided 10/94. Also made the following suggestions; DAs qtrly reports specify # of ADL exceptions obsoleted due to tech data update; code 4025 sample often used TDPs for use of exceptions; concentrate on eliminating ADL exceptions from these packages; and start with all TDPs used in 76MM HE-IR. Agreed the NAWC data was a better way to present data to the PAT.

4/95 NSWCR (402) - Provided FY 95 data for 5"/54 prop charge and HE-PD/D and 76MM HE-IR as the major cal sample. No pyro/demo was provided. The only real concern was the total of 351 for the "no. of exceptions same as previous PDP".

7/95 NSWCR (4025) - Provided FY 95 and FY 96 data for 5"/54 prop charge and HE-PD/D and 76MM HE-IR as the major cal sample. No pyro/demo was provided. FY 96 exceptions will go up as the FY 96 ADLs are not all done yet.

2/96 NSWCR (402) - Provided FY 95 and FY 96 exception data for 5"/54 prop charge and HE-PD/D and 76MM HE-IR as the major cal sample. No pyro/demo was provided and the PAT decided they did not need pyro/demo in the future as there were so few. The Crane Pyro/demo TDPs have been kept very current. A lot of exceptions still remain on the 5" and 76 mm. For example, for FY 96 the total drawing exceptions = 285; specs exceptions = 298; other = 55; number of exceptions incorporated = 18; NORs/SCNs utilized = 17; exceptions remaining = 638; exceptions same as previous PDP = 288 and admin exceptions = 92.

6/96 NSWCR (4025) - Stated they had 2 meetings with the 2T DAs and the DAs agreed to report the # of exceptions on the quarterly reports to PM4. 4025 will still summarize the 2T data once per year and brief it to the PAT. (next time Nov 97)

10/96 NAWC (110000E) - Provide a 1 page brief showing the their effort for this action for one item, M73 cable assembly. They had spent 24 hours for this item along and felt like the time could have been spent better elsewhere. Recommended this action be discontinued and closed.

10/97 NSWCR (PM4A) - Stated the 2T community no longer needed to track this in the PAT as they had a formal action for the 2T DAs to organize a mini PAT and develop their own indicators per the Jul 96 DA meeting. This indicator should be covered by the mini PAT and they would be briefing their indicators at each Jul DA meeting. All agreed to close this action for the PAT.

**2E/2T ACQUISITION PROCUREMENT/PRODUCTION
PROCESS ACTION TEAM (PAT)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 57-492 **REQ COMPLETION DATE:** ONGOING

ISSUE/PROBLEM: Commodities are not always delivered to the destinations listed in the latest revision of the MIPRs.

STATUS: OPEN: MONITOR: **CLOSED:** XXX

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: TOM GREEN
SARA BROWN

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

4/92 SPCC - Provide AMCCOM examples of programs that were not delivered to the destinations listed in the latest MIPR amendment.

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

6/92 SPCC - Provided examples to the PAT (7.62MM) where they delivered to destinations different from the latest MIPR amendment. This issue had also been addressed by SPCC and PM4A at the May 1992 meeting with AMCCOM (DS, PC, PD). The PAT agreed to close this action as the issue will be addressed in Action 55-1091 by the internal AMCCOM PAT.

**2E/2T ACQUISITION PROCUREMENT/PRODUCTION
PROCESS ACTION TEAM (PAT)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 58-492 **REQ COMPLETION DATE:** FEB 93

ISSUE/PROBLEM: Special clauses in contracts.

STATUS: **OPEN:** **MONITOR:** **CLOSED:** XXX

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: BRAD SITZ

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

4/92 AMCCOM - Define the process of implementing special contract clauses at AMCCOM on Navy contracts.

6/92 AMCCOM - Will provide a copy of "special contract clauses" put in Navy Contracts to all tech agencies and SPCC on PAT 2/3.

6/92 NSWC Crane (0541RM) - Coordinate with QAM-P to incorporate this process into the Acq. Process Model.

8/92 AMCCOM/NSWC Crane (0541RM) - Both actions of 4/92 remain open.

1/93 AMCCOM (QAM) - Prepare a JOCG issue paper on Navy special contract clauses not getting into AMCCOM contracts. Provide examples of Navy special clauses this AMCCOM policy will affect with supported recommendations in the paper so it can be submitted to the JOCG/Acquisition Subgroup. Fax it to PM4A.

1/93 NSWC Crane (PM4A) - After receiving QAM issue paper submit it formally to the JOCG/Acquisition Subgroup at the next meeting.

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

6/92 SPCC - Briefed the approval process for implementing the "special contract clause". November 1991 AMC Policy directs a review of all existing special (Non F.A.R.) contract clauses. AMCs intent is to eliminate special clauses. February 1992 CG AMCCOM directed SES to conduct a prototype solicitation Div. Project. The intent was to eliminate unnecessary special clauses.

1/93 AMCCOM (QAM) - Provide necessary members a copy of the "special contract clauses" put in contracts on Navy items. Also provided a brief sheet on the current AMC/AMCCOM policy on decreasing special contract clauses. To get a non-standard

clause adopted into PADDs requires the local concurrence of the Director of QA, PP, PCA and legal GC. Once local AMCCOM approval is obtained, the clause is reviewed by AMC for signature. Then it is assigned a 6 digit # and is put in PADDs.

ACTION #58-492 (CONTINUED)

4/93 PM4A - QAM stated the issue was QA clauses in contracts after the 1/93 PAT meeting. PM4A stated the issue was briefed to the JOCG/ACQ Subgroup in Feb 1993. The issue was a none issue for the subgroup and should be closed in the PAT as it was covered in other actions. An MOU had been written by the QA subgroup for SPC and CP2 was in action item 65-892. The group agreed to close this action.

**2E/2T ACQUISITION PROCUREMENT/PRODUCTION
PROCESS ACTION TEAM (PAT)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 59-492 **REQ COMPLETION DATE:**

ISSUE/PROBLEM: Effectiveness of standard PDP format.

STATUS: **OPEN:** **MONITOR:** **CLOSED:**XXX

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: LIZ EAGLES

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

4/92 NSWC IH/AMCCOM - Determine if the newly implemented standardized PDP format is improving the PDP process in both AMCCOM and the Navy.

6/92 NSWC IH - Action of 4/92 remains open.

8/92 NSWC IH - Continue to provide data to include the following elements; # of PDPs submitted, # of PDPs rejected by AMCCOM, # of deliverables req in PDP, # of deliverables implemented in the contract and to validate the contract distribution.

8/92 NSWC Crane (402) - Review the FY-93 2T TDPs to assure an outdated SQAP letter, e.g., Crane ltr 8000 Ser 5025/U2248 of May 90 is not still being referenced.

1/93 NSWC IH - Action of 8/92 remains open.

4/93 NSWC IH - Action of 8/92 remains open.

7/93 NSWC IH - Action of 8/92 remains open.

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

6/92 AMCCOM (QAM-P) - Reported on discussions with AMCCOM (BAT), and other codes, on the stand PDPs. Concerns are; D+CDRLs are sometimes outdated and unsubstantiated deliverables requirements.

Otherwise, the general reaction of AMCCOM is satisfactory.

8/92 NSWC IH (570D) - Provided data by commodity (FY-92 & FY-93) showing the number of PDPs submitted and rejected by AMCCOM, number of deliverables requested in the PDPs and implemented in the contract and validated the contract distribution.

8/92 ALL - A lengthy discussion took place on DIDs. The Navy cannot put DIDs in their requirements unless they are in DOD 5010.12-L (Acquisition Management System Data Requirement List). A few examples were provided by AMCCOM where the Navy 2T activity had requested DIDs that were not in the DOD manual.

ACTION #59-492 (CONTINUED)

1/93 NSWC Crane (402) - Stated that the FY 93 2T TDPs do not contain the outdated SQAP of May 90. This was verified by Code 402 who provided the current 2T SQAP to the necessary members.
9/93 - The group decided to close this action as it appeared AMCCOM was having no problem with Navy PDPs.

**2E/2T ACQUISITION PROCUREMENT/PRODUCTION
PROCESS ACTION TEAM (PAT)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 60-492 **REQ COMPLETION DATE:** APR 94

ISSUE/PROBLEM: Activities receive no planning dates for submission of PDPs.

STATUS: **OPEN:** **MONITOR:** **CLOSED:** XXX

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: SARA BROWN/DOUG SMITH
CDR WALKLEY

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

4/92 NSWC Crane/AMCCOM - Address the timing of the AMCCOM (BAT) letters defining when PDPs are required by AMCCOM. Target November time frame.

6/92 AMCCOM (PD) - Will provide the Consolidated Ammunition Procurement (CAP) report to NSWC Crane (Code 402) for (2T) and PEO(T) for (2E). The report will identify when the PDPs are required. Target date is September each year.

1/93 AMCCOM (PD) - Action of 6/92 remains open but the product provided to BAC may be different than the CAP report.

4/93 AMCCOM (PD) - Provide a consolidated procurement report for all FY 95 procurements to each of the Engineering Agents on the PAT. Provide a copy to AMCCOM (BAT & QAM) and NSWC (PM4). Target date is May 1993 to represent the PP2S submitted for the Presidents budget.

7/93 AMCCOM (PDM)/NVLNO - Action of 4/93 remains open. NVLNO will assist in defining the data elements needed and when and how to best get them.

9/93 AMCCOM (PDW)/NVLNO - Develop/provide a annual procurement report (first for all FY 95 procurements) to each of the Navy technical agents, AMCCOM (QAM, BAC) and NSWC (PM4). The intent

of the report is primarily to identify when the PDPs are required from the Navy tech agents. (Target date is Sept-Oct each year.)

NVLNO will assist in defining the data elements needed and how/when to best get them.

1/94 AMCCOM (PDW/NVLNO) - Action of 9/93 remains open. Provide format of the annual procurement report at the April 1994 meeting.

ACTION #60-492 (CONTINUED)

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

6/92 AMCCOM (QAM-P) - Briefed the PAT on the history and current status of putting out the AMCCOM call letter for PDPs. Detailed paper was provided.

1/93 AMCCOM (PD) - Stated that PD had not provided the CAP report to the Navy or to BAC because there were some errors in it. Discussion centered around the fact that a forecast/data with a few holes in it were better than no data at all.

4/93 - After much discussion the action was clarified to PD's understanding.

7/93 - After another detailed discussion of what was needed from PD and why BAT/QAM also needed the planning data as the subject indicates, the NVLNO agreed to assist PDM in defining the necessary data and determine how to get it.

9/93 AMCCOM (PDW) - Again there was much detailed discussion as in 7/93 actions taken. PDW provided a computer print out with some of the data elements needed but the issued/requirement of this action was still not satisfied.

1/94 - After much discussion the need for the annual procurement report out of PD was again clarified. The intent remains as stated in the 9/93 action.

4/94 ALL - After much discussion the Engineering activities thought the issue was OBE as they had developed other ways of prioritizing their TDP workload. The QAM rep had no position as to their need. All agreed to close this action.

**2E/2T ACQUISITION PROCUREMENT/PRODUCTION
PROCESS ACTION TEAM (PAT)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 61-492 **REQ COMPLETION DATE:** ONGOING

ISSUE/PROBLEM: Are MIPR numbers still required with applicable PDP?

STATUS: OPEN: MONITOR: **CLOSED:** XXX

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: BRAD SITZ

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

Investigate with AMCCOM (BAT) and other applicable AMCCOM codes whether MIPR #s are still required with the PDPs (is there any current value added).

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

6/92 AMCCOM (QAM-P) - Stated MIPRs numbers are not required on the PDPs. This was the consensus of DS, PD and QA. The group agreed to close this action.

**2E/2T ACQUISITION PROCUREMENT/PRODUCTION
PROCESS ACTION TEAM (PAT)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 62-692 **REQ COMPLETION DATE:** SEPT 93

ISSUE/PROBLEM: Cost of Acquisition Process. (Performance Indicator)

STATUS: **OPEN:** **MONITOR:** **CLOSED:** XXX

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: LIZ EAGLES

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

6/92 PEO(T) - Provide the cost of 2E Acquisition Process data to PM4 by 28 July 1992.

6/92 NSWC Crane (PM4) - Breakout the 2T cost to Blue Water and SOF.

8/92 NSWC IH (570D) - Provide the cost of 2E Acquisition Process at the next meeting.

1/93 NSWC IH - Action of 8/92 remains open.

4/93 NSWC IH - Action of 8/92 remains open.

7/93 NSWC IH - Action of 8/92 remains open.

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

6/92 NSWC Crane (PM4) - Provided a pie chart showing \$21.9 million as the total cost of the 2T Acquisition Process.

6/92 PEO (T) - Is developing their data and agreed that putting

the data in a pie chart is satisfactory.

9/93 - The group agreed to close this action as the QMB no longer is requesting this data.

**2E/2T ACQUISITION PROCUREMENT/PRODUCTION
PROCESS ACTION TEAM (PAT)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER:	63-692	REQ COMPLETION DATE:	
----------------------------	--------	-----------------------------	--

ISSUE/PROBLEM: Review Test Activity LAT/FAT cost estimates and expenditures.

STATUS:	OPEN:	MONITOR:	CLOSED: XXX
----------------	--------------	-----------------	--------------------

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: BRAD SITZ\BOB VAN HYFT
STEVE THOMAS

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

6/92 AMCCOM (QAM-P) - Select several 2T/2E sample items and provide historical data of the number of lots funded vs. lots tested/delivered, funds issued and funds obligated. Provide report at the next meeting.

8/92 NSWC Crane (PM4A) - Organize a working group made up of QAM, NSWC 402, PMTC and WPNSTA Earle to address the following issues:

- (A) Potential reduction of LAT after a producer has been proven.
- (B) Potential high LAT test costs at the Navy test activities.

- (C) Are LAT funds returned when the lots tested are less than funded.
- (D) Identify the process by which Navy test activities can return left over LAT samples to the active inventory or dispose of them.

Select 5 - 10 items for example with potential audits of test activities.

1/93 NSWC Crane (PM4A) - Action of 8/92 remains open.

4/93 NSWC Crane (PM4A) - Review another Navy test activity to address issues (A) through (C) in action of 8/92.

7/93 NSWC Crane (PM4A) - Report the results of the NSWC Dahlgren review scheduled for 20 July 1993.

9/93 AMCCOM (QAM) - Compare Army vs Navy LAT tests/costs on similar fuzes:
-MK 399 PD/D (Army buy)
-MK 407 PD/D (Navy buy)

Carry over action from Dahlgren review in July 1993.

9/93 AMCCOM (QAM) - Work with PD to assure BTR monthly report of action 35-491 also contains samples from a LAP facility.

Carry over action from Dahlgren review in July 1993.

ACTION #63-692 (CONTINUED)

9/93 AMCCOM (QAM) - Assure the BTR #s are getting on the "pending data cards" sent to the test activities so samples received can be tracked to BTRs.

Carry over action from Dahlgren review in July 1993.

9/93 AMCCOM (QAM) - Identify the process by which QAM notifies the test activity and technical agent of lot acceptance/rejection.

1/94 AMCCOM (QAM) - All four actions of 9/93 remain open.

4/94 AMCCOM (QAM) - All four actions of 9/93 remain open.

6/94 AMCCOM (QAM) - Standardize the process by which AMCCOM notifies the Navy technical agent and the test activity of lot acceptance/rejection. A copy of the PCO letter to the contractor is preferred. Report status/policy at the next meeting.

6/94 AMCCOM (QAM) - Assure the BTR #s are getting on the "pending data cards" sent to the test activities so samples received can be tracked to BTRs.

10/94 AMCCOM (QAM) - Both actions of 6/94 remain open.

10/94 NSWC Crane (4020) - For all FY 94 Navy developed pyro/demo procurements, provide DODIC level data showing LAT/FAT test costs vs hardware costs. Explain high test costs where appropriate.

1/95 AMCCOM (QAM) - Provide PAT members a copy of the QAM policy

memo requiring PQMs to send a memo to PCOs identifying lot acceptance/rejection from LAT/FAT and reiterating the appropriate Navy tech agent who was to be notified by the PCO (e.g. copied on the PCO letter to the contractor).

1/95 NSWC CR (4025) - Coordinate with China Lake to standardize reporting of LAT results on 2T ammunition such as that provided by Dahlgren and Crane. Issue letter to Dahlgren and China Lake instructing them what parts of 2T fuze test data should be classified.

1/95 NSWC CR (4025) - Action of 10/94 remains open.

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

8/92 AMCCOM (QAM) - Provided data on several 2T/2E items with several conclusions which lead to further actions by the PAT. The conclusions were: a majority of PRONS for Navy gun ammo (5"/54, 76MM, etc..) are filled with only 1 or 2 production lots; most 2T/2E MIPR requirements are too small to take advantage of skip lot testing; test projects are spread over as many as 3 test activities with no apparent reason and the Navy tech activities do not appear to reduce test requirements on items being procured from proven producers.

ACTION #63-692 (CONTINUED)

1/93 AMCCOM (QAM) - Briefed the group on more examples of high test cost items, the MK 120 through MK 127 Non-Electric Blasting Caps. Provided a three page point paper trying to address each of the questions intended to be addressed by the working group which had not been organized by PM4A yet.

4/93 NSWC Crane (PM4A) - Provided results of the Pyro/Demo LAT/FAT review at Crane in March 1993. About 10 items were reviewed during the meeting with PM4A/15, 402 and 405. A typical process (LAT/FAT related) for an FY 93 buy was briefed. Several changes to the process were made and most were agreed to by AMCCOM (QAM) in a 13 April 1993 QAM letter which was handed out.

Several recommendations were also made and endorsed by the PAT; reopen action 35-491 to provide the test activities with a monthly BTR status report as QAM had not completed it yet; open a new action for PC to define how to retain a proven producer; open a new action for QAM/PD to provide advance funds to the test activities for SOPs/fixturing/matl per the issue paper submitted by NSWC 405 and have QAM issue a letter to the appropriate test

activities identifying the process of what to do with excess samples.

7/93 NSWC Crane (PM4A)- Stated the next test activity review was scheduled for 20 July 1993 at NSWC Dahlgren. The review would cover LAT/FAT of 5"/54 and 76mm ammo.

9/93 NSWC Crane (PM4A) - Provided results of the 5"/54 and 76MM FAT/LAT review at Dahlgren in July 1993. All 5" and 76MM items were reviewed. QAM, Dahl G-61 and PM4A, PM413 and 402) participated. Reduced sample sizes were noted on 5" primers and cases. Funds were returned on 8 items when appropriate. "What to do with excess samples" has been documented. Determination whether costs are high at Dahlgren was difficult since they do not break down costs as does Crane 405. Charge weight assessment tests need updating (firing, 4 days, change barrel) at a cost of \$62 per propellant lot. IH was tasked at the August 1993 2T DA meeting to compare the Navy process to the Army Dynagun process of charge weight assessment. Other actions were assigned to QAM at the Dahlgren meeting (actions stated in 9/93 req actions for QAM) and remain open. The group agreed further visits to other test activities are not necessary and this action can be closed after QAM completes the 9/93 actions assigned.

9/93 AMCCOM (PDW) - Briefed the group on how a PRON is constructed and what the digits of a PRON meant.

ACTION #63-692 (CONTINUED)

6/94 AMCCOM (QAM) - Presented a comparison of Army vs Navy LAT tests/costs on similar PD fuzes, MK 399-1 (ARDEC buy) vs MK 407 (Navy buy). The testing requirements for both fuzes are identical. Yuma Proving Ground test costs on the MK 399 are \$5mil which equates to more dollars per lot than Dahlgren's costs on the MK 407 fuze (\$61k/lot). YPG is charging TECOM overhead onto all of their projects. This cost is approx. \$2.7mil of the \$5mil. All funds are paid out of the CAWCF.

QAM has issued a memo to all PQMs directing them to assure BTR #s are being annotated by contractors on the data cards being sent to test activities but it is not being accomplished to date.

QAM will not issue monthly BTR reports to the Navy test activity. This is addressed in action # 35-491.

QAM does not have a standard policy requiring test activities and ISEAs be notified of lot acceptance/rejection

results. Most PQMs are sending a copy of their recommendations to the PCO, test activity, and ISEA. The formal PCO letters are not being sent as often.

QAM also presented data showing high Navy test costs vs the contract value. Primarily demo/EOD items.

1/95 AMCCOM (QAM) - Stated QAM was preparing a memo to all PQMs requiring them to send a memo to PCO identifying lot acceptance/rejection for LAT/FAT and reiterating the Navy technical agent so PCO could notify them of the same. No one could justify why the test activity needed a copy of LAT/FAT acceptance/rejection so the PAT cancelled the requirement (Crane 405 was present).

Also addressed was a problem with China Lake classifying all fuze test results on 2T ammunition and providing inconsistent LAT/FAT reports vs that provided by Dahlgren and Crane.

4/95 NSWC CR (4025) - Stated they had contacted China Lake rep who had agreed to report pass/fail data. Crane also sent letter, 23 Feb 95, to China Lake and Dahlgren on proper classification of fuze test results.

4/95 AMCCOM (QAM) - Provided two memos. The first was an internal memo for QAM-A/C/I, 10 April 95, on the "Policy for Distribution of Lot Acceptance Notification on Navy Items". The PQMs are to advise their respective PCOs of the Navy test activities need for official notification for acceptance or rejection of a lot and to provide a list of those activities for distribution. The second memo was an internal memo for QAM-A/C/I, 10 April 95, on the need to annotated ammo data cards with the BTR number on Navy contracts. This will help the receiving test activity to identify the sample and speed processing.

ACTION #63-692 (CONTINUED)

4/95 CR (PM4/402) - Debated whether to close this action or not in view of the remaining action for Crane (402) of 1/95, FY 94 Pryo/demo LAT/FAT costs vs actual hardware costs. Decided to move this last part of the action to action item #37-692 and close this action.

**2E/2T ACQUISITION PROCUREMENT/PRODUCTION
PROCESS ACTION TEAM (PAT)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER:	65-892	REQ COMPLETION DATE:	
----------------------------	--------	-----------------------------	--

ISSUE/PROBLEM: Lack of Navy participation in the AMCCOM (QA) Contractor Certification Program (CP2).

STATUS:	OPEN:	MONITOR:	CLOSED:	XXX
----------------	--------------	-----------------	----------------	-----

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: G. T. LAPOINTE

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

8/92 NWAC (MS-26) - Chair a PAT working group to identify Navy concerns with the AMCCOM CP2 contractor certification program and establish the process/procedure to assure the Navy is involved in the AMCCOM process. Brief the outcome at the next PAT meeting but immediate involvement is necessary. Members should include PMTC 4021, NSWC Crane 402 and 404, NSWC IH 570D and WPNSTA Earle.

1/93 NWAC (MS-26) - Report the results on the working group meeting to be held at AMCCOM on 27 January 1993.

4/93 NWAC (MS-26) - Brief the status of the entire issue at the next meeting. Include proposed resolutions to each issue/concern identified in the NWAC point paper on 4 April 1993 sent to NAVAIR for potential submission to OPNAV.

4/93 NWAC (MS-26) - Readdress the issue with PMA-201A to try to resolve their concerns presented 4/93.

4/93 NSWC Crane (PM4) - Coordinate with the NAVSEA JOCG and EX COM members so they understand the NAVSEA side of the JOCG agrees with the MOA for CP2 and a compromise is being worked out at the PAT/JOCG Subgroup level.

7/93 NWAC (MS-26) - Both actions of 4/93 remain open.

9/93 NWAC (MS-26) - Brief the latest status of the CP2 issue to include the Army/Navy working group meeting scheduled for 23 September 1993 at Crane. Provide PAT members a copy of the new MOA and modified contract clause to be generated during the meeting.

1/94 NWAC (MS-26) - Brief the latest status of CP2.

4/94 NWAD (MS-26) - Action of 1/94 remains open.

6/94 NWAD (MS-26) - Brief the latest status of CP2 at the next meeting.

10/94 NWAD (MS-26) - Monitor the status of the CP2 issue until the MOA gets adequately documented in DOD 5160.65M.

ACTION #65-892 (CONTINUED)

1/95 NWAD (MS-26) - At the February 95 JOCG/QA Subgroup meeting, address how and if the thrust of the signed CP2 MOA can be incorporated into DOD 5160.65M. Report JOCG/QA decision at the next meeting.

4/95 NWAD (MS-26) - Action of 1/95 remains open. Since the minutes of the JOCG/QA Subgroup meeting of Feb 95 did not address the 1/95 action, coordinate with AMCCOM QA to address how and if the thrust of the signed CP2 MOA can be incorporated into DOD 5160.65M.

7/95 NWAD (MS-26) - Action of 4/95 remains open.

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

1/93 NWAC (MS-26) - Briefed the group on the Navy's concerns with CP2. These concerns had been discussed with QA at AMCCOM in August 1992. They agreed that it was a good effort but there were some clauses the Navy did not agree with e.g. eliminating function test at the discretion of the contractor. AMCCOM (QA) had committed to get the Services involved. NSWC Crane (402) had been involved in two CP2 audits which were well done. The Navy is planning on drafting an MOU with the SMCA. The PAT working group will meet with QA at AMCCOM on 27 January 1993.

4/93 NWAC (MS-26) - Stated that NWAC (MS-26), NSWC Crane (402), AMCCOM and PMTC met January 1993 at AMCCOM. They identified the Navy concerns with CP2; drafted an MOA for CP2 use on Navy commodities and drafted a modified contract clause for Navy commodities. The draft MOA and contract clause was passed out to the members. NWAC stated that AIR PMA-201A did not want the Navy to use CP2 until all concerns were resolved and they did not support using an MOA. Also discussed was the use of CP2 on the FMU-140 fuze contract and the letters from AMCCOM (CG) and another from NAVAIR. Both letters were passed out.

7/93 NSWC Crane (PM4) - Stated the NAVSEA ex-com reps were not made aware of the CP2 issue before the last JOCG ex-com meeting but they had heard nothing negative from them since the meeting.

9/93 NWAC (MS-26) - Briefed the group on the prior and current accomplishments toward CP2. In June 1993 NWAC met with PMA-201 and they now agreed with the MOA approach. The JOCG/QA Subgroup formed an ad hoc group to address the Service's concerns with CP2. The group met 9 June 1993 and all Services except the Army agreed with the Navy concerns. Crane 402, NWAC (MS-26) and QAM also went to several different contractor CP2 audits with

ACTION #65-892 (CONTINUED)

excellent results. NWAC also provided a flag level issue paper they had been asked to prepare 30 June 1993, stating the Navy concerns. CP2 was briefed to the JOCG/EX-COM in August 1993 by QAD with negative results as the Subgroup had not agreed to the issues yet. NWAC, PM4A and Crane 402 attended a JOCG/QA Subgroup meeting in September 1993. The subgroup agreed to have the Navy and Army again review the MOA and current contract clause on CP2 for a compromise. An Army/Navy ad hoc meeting is scheduled at Crane 23 September 1993.

1/94 NWAC (MS-26) - Provided the recent highlights on CP2.

Attended an JOCG/QA ad hoc working group meeting, 23 Sept 93 at Crane, intended to outline remaining Navy concerns. Provided outcome of this meeting to all PAT members. Attended ADPA symposium on CP2 at Bettendorf, Iowa in Nov 93. Then attended another ad hoc working group meeting 2 Dec 93 to identify possible strategies acceptable to all Services. Also provided a Marine Corps letter of Dec 93 which stated the Marine Corps would do an independent audit of CP2. Provided the AMCCOM (DO) response to the Marine Corps letter. AMC/AMCCOM legal have directed that the current CP2 contract clause is not legal and will be pulled from all current contracts. The clause will probably be amended and then reentered. CP2 had also been briefed to the JOCG/EX-COM by the QA chairman but it would not be briefed to the JOCG yet.

4/94 NWAD (MS-26) - Stated no real action had taken place since the last meeting. The QA subgroup will be meeting in May 94 per PM4A and CP2 may be on the agenda.

6/94 NSWC CRANE (PM4A) - Briefly stated the outcome of the JOCG/QA meeting in May 94 with regard to CP2. The Services were asked to comment on a draft MOA, costumer guide on CP2 and an interim report of AMC. AMC has set up PAT teams on CP2 in which the Services asked participate. The Marine Corps independent study of CP2 was not briefed at the JOCG/QA meeting as per the MC rep it was between the MC and AMCCOM at this time. Objection by the other Services had been voice over this.

10/94 NWAD (MS-26) - Briefed the final results of the CP2 issue with the JOCG/QA subgroup. All Services had commented on the CP2 MOA. All Services met again in June 94 to finalize MOA. The MOA was signed by AIR on 7 Sep 94 and all other Services have since signed it but a signed copy was not available yet. Final MOA was handed out. NWAD recommended to close action for CP2 but the PAT thought it should be monitored until the MOA gets incorporated

ACTION #65-892 (CONTINUED)

into 5160.65M. Additional discussion/recommendations were aimed at DODs new specs/stds policy briefed by PM4A. All recommendations were recorded in minutes to this 10/94 meeting.

1/95 NWAD (MS-26) - Passed out the signed CP2 MOA between the Services. NWAD will address putting part or all of the MOA into chapter 5 of DOD 5160.65M at the February 95 JOCG/QA meeting.

7/95 NSWC CR (PM4A) - Stated chapter 5 of DOD 5160.65M is out for review to QA principle members, due back by 15 Aug 95. If the CP2 MOA is to be incorporated this is the time. NWADs and NSWC (4021) comments should include its incorporation.

7/95 NVLNO - Stated they participated (June 95) in MILAN AAP's initial attempt to get CP2 recertified. Their books and answers to their previous problems were in order, but they could not demonstrated as they had not actually implemented then yet.

Recertification was not given yet.

2/96 NWAD (MS-26) - Passed out and discussed the JOCG/QA Subgroup annual report. The thrust of the signed CP2 MOA has been incorporated in DOD 5160.65M. All agreed to close this action.

**2E/2T ACQUISITION PROCUREMENT/PRODUCTION
PROCESS ACTION TEAM (PAT)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 66-892 **REQ COMPLETION DATE:** SEPT 93

ISSUE/PROBLEM: Tracking "Cost Avoidance" for Actions as they are closed. (Performance Indicator)

STATUS: **OPEN:** **MONITOR:** **CLOSED:** XXX

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: J. D. LYNCH

MARK EMBREE

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

8/92 NSWCR Crane (PM4) - Estimate the cost avoidance achieved as each action item is closed. Additionally, revisit the previously closed actions to complete the list.

1/93 NSWCR Crane (PM4C) - Prepare and forward a work sheet/form to all members to calculate the tangible and intangible cost avoidances applicable to all closed actions.

1/93 ALL MEMBERS - The lead activity for each closed action should calculate the tangible and intangible cost avoidances per the PM4C work sheet/form.

4/93 ALL MEMBERS - Action of 1/93 remains open.

7/93 ALL MEMBERS - Action of 1/93 remains open.

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

1/93 NSWCR Crane (PM4C) - Briefed a two prong approach to measurement of cost savings/avoidances; tangible and intangible.

Presented intangible as "productive capacity increase (CPUs)".

4/93 SPCC - Provided cost avoidance data for actions 4,5,9,18 and 32.

4/93 WPNSTA Earle - Reported no cost avoidance for action 41.

7/93 NWAC (MS-16) - Provided cost avoidance for action 79.

9/93 ALL - The group agreed to close this action as the QMB no longer requires this data from the Acquisition PAT.

**2E/2T ACQUISITION PROCUREMENT/PRODUCTION
PROCESS ACTION TEAM (PAT)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 67-892 **REQ COMPLETION DATE:** MAY 96

ISSUE/PROBLEM: Five Year Procurement Plans for 2E are not provided to the Technical Activities.

STATUS: **OPEN:** **MONITOR:** **CLOSED:** XXX

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: CARL LOUCK

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

8/92 NSWC IH (570D) - Coordinate with NAVAIR PEO(T) to establish the policy/procedure to routinely provide the 2E technical activities with a five year procurement plan generated from the PP-2s.

1/93 NSWC IH (570D) - Action of 8/92 remains open.

4/93 NSWC IH (570D) - Action of 8/92 remains open.

7/93 NSWC IH (570D) - Action of 8/92 remains open.

9/93 AMCCOM (DSS) - Identify to Crane (404) which NAVAIR codes/offices are submitting 2E cog PP2s to AMCCOM. Target 15 October 1993.

9/93 NSWC Crane (404) - Coordinate with NAVAIR to establish the policy/procedure to routinely provide the 2E technical activities with a five year procurement plan generated from the PP2s.

1/94 NAVAIR (242P)/NSWC Cane (404) - Action of 9/93 remains open.

Assure the plans are being received by the tech activities.

4/94 NAVAIR (242P) - Action of 1/94 remains open as the process does not appear to be institutionalized.

6/94 NAVAIR (242P) - Action of 4/94 remains open.

10/94 NWSC Crane (PM4C) - Pull 2E PP-2 procurement data electronically from AMCCOM. Data needed should show the 5 year procurement buys by DODIC. Provide data to NAWC (P2603) and explain how NAWC can pull data direct from AMCCOM in the future.

10/94 NAWC (P2603) - Verify above action for PM4C is OK by NAVAIR. NAWC can also distribute 2E data to other 2E Technical agencies.

1/95 NAWC (P2603) - Verify 2E PP-2 data can be pulled as PM4C stated 1/95, and then distribute the 5 year procurement (PP-2) data to the other 2E technical agents on the PAT.

4/95 NAWC (P2603A) - Action of 1/95 remains open.

7/95 NAWC (11000E) - Action of 1/95 remains open.

ACTION 67-892 (CONTINUED)

2/96 NAWC (110000E) - Action of 1/95 remains open.

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

1/94 NSWC (404) - Stated that AMCCOM (DSS) had provided code 404 with a NAVAIR POC to call to routinely get 5 year procurements sent to the NAVAIR technical agents. The POC was called who agreed to send plans but no plans had been received by any of the technical activities yet.

10/94 - The group decided there may be an easier way to get a 5 year plan for the 2E agencies. Pull it electronically from AMCCOM. There would still be pieces missing, e.g. procurements outside the SMCA, but it was better than nothing.

1/95 NSWCR (PM4C) - Stated PM4 had pulled their PP-2 data electronically from AMCCOM, and told NAWC how to do so for the 2E data.

1/95 NAWC (P2603) - Stated NAVAIR said it was OK for the tech agent to pull the data from AMCCOM.

2/96 NSWCR (PM4C) - Gave NAWC the internet protocol address to get access to the IOC PP-2 files. NAWC may need to get an access password from the IOC to get into their PRIME system.

6/96 ALL - After much discussion about this old action the PAT agreed to close it. It did no longer need to be tracked by the PAT per NAWC.

**2E/2T ACQUISITION PROCUREMENT/PRODUCTION
PROCESS ACTION TEAM (PAT)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 68-892 **REQ COMPLETION DATE:** JAN 94

ISSUE/PROBLEM: PDPs prior to FY 93 do not identify the proper marking e.g. POP, UN, or Coast Guard marking. AMCCOM (QA) is sometimes holding up shipments of produced items for lack of these markings.

STATUS: **OPEN:** **MONITOR:** **CLOSED:** XXX

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: BRAD SITZ
 SCOTT RIDEOUT

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

8/92 AMCCOM (QAM)/WPNSTA Earle (5013) - Review the current policy on markings to assure consistent policies are being applied by both the Navy and the Army. WPNSTA Earle - Provide official correspondence to the Navy tech activities and PMs identifying the policies for POP, UN and Coast Guard markings. Reference previous correspondence if necessary. DUE 20 SEPTEMBER.

8/92 AMCCOM (QAM) - Generate a list of PDPs, for FY-92 and prior year procurements not yet delivered, for which there are improper POP, UN or Coast Guard markings identified. Identify the list by 2E, 2T and the appropriate tech activity and provide the list to the tech activities with a copy to the PM. DUE 15 OCTOBER.

8/92 ALL TECHNICAL ACTIVITIES - Review existing PDP/ADL exceptions on FY-92 and prior year procurements not yet delivered, to assure proper POP, UN and Coast Guard markings are identified per the Earle correspondence above. Compare the list to that provided by QAM above prior to submitting a change to the PDP. DUE 1 NOVEMBER.

1/93 AMCCOM (QAM) - Review Navy PDPs and ADL exceptions and generate a list of PDPs, for FY 92 and prior year procurements not yet delivered, for which there are improper POP, UN and Coast Guard markings identified. Identify them by 2E, 2T and the appropriate tech activity and provide the list to the tech activities with a copy to the PM. DUE 1 MARCH 1993.

1/93 ALL TECHNICAL ACTIVITIES - Action of 8/92 remains open but base review on updated 1/93 QAM PDP list. DUE 30 MARCH 1993.

1/93 WPNSTA Earle - Make sure all members are on distribution for SWO-20A-CSF Volume 1 & 2.

ACTION # 68-892 (CONTINUED)

4/93 NSWC IH (570D) - Investigate the PDP/ADLs for the MK 23 JATO and components of the 2.75 rocket to assure proper POP/UN markings are included.

7/93 NSWC IH (570D) - Action of 4/93 remains open.

9/93 WPNSTA Earle - Clarify NAVSEA SWO-20A-CSAF on reused containers to allow the use of the year of packing/container reuse and not the year of manufacture for POP markings.

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

1/93 AMCCOM (QAM) - Provided data showing that with the exception of the 2T medium caliber and fuzes almost all 2T PDPs contained obsolete marking instructions. ADL exceptions were not reviewed by QAM. Per the 2T community, they should show all proper markings are identified.

1/93 WPNSTA Earle - Stated and QAM concurred, that there is no difference between the current Navy and AMCCOM policy on markings. Also stated that NAVSEA SWO-20A-CSAF Volume 1 & 2, which replaces OP-2165, has been published in January 1993. DLA also has an electronic data base, PC POP3, for detailed information on marking requirements. Bob Dress at WPNSTA Earle is the single point of contact for the Navy on POP (telephone 908-577-2821)

4/93 AMCCOM (QAM) - Provided status review of Navy PDPs. Overall Navy compliance is excellent. All 93 RODs for incorrect or missing POP/UN markings have been against IH managed items. The specific items are the MK 23 JATO and various components of the 2.75 inch rocket (Hydra 70). As of 1 March 1993, all of the Hydra 70 contracts have been modified to incorporate the required UN markings. RODs continue to be generated against lots produced prior to these contract mods.

4/93 WPNSTA Earle - Stated all activities are on distribution for SWO-20A-CSF which replaces OP-2165. A list of who the addresses was passed out.

1/94 WPNSTA Earle - Stated the NAVSEA SWO-20A-CSAF document does and always has allowed the use of the year of packing/container reuse for POP markings. The document allows either year of manufacture or year of packing/container reuse (section 2-3.6.4E). The group agreed to close this action.

**2E/2T ACQUISITION PROCUREMENT/PRODUCTION
PROCESS ACTION TEAM (PAT)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER:	70-892	REQ COMPLETION DATE:	APR 93
----------------------------	--------	-----------------------------	--------

ISSUE/PROBLEM: The Navy sometimes requires MIL-I but AMCCOM (QAM) changes the requirement to MIL-Q. Potential problems are created.

STATUS: OPEN: MONITOR: CLOSED: XXX

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: SCOTT RIDEOUT

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

8/92 WPNSTA Earle - Identify examples where the Navy required MIL-I and the SMCA changed it to MIL-Q. What problems were created.

1/93 AMCCOM (QAM) - Brief the PAT on what the AMCCOM policy is on when to use MIL-I vs. MIL-Q. Based on WPNSTA Earle brief on 1/93 MIL-Q is being used unnecessarily.

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

1/93 WPNSTA Earle - Identified 4 contracts where the SMCA had changed to MIL-Q when the Navy required MIL-I; the MK 11/2 pallet adapters (Delfasco DAAA09-92-C-0366); the MK 16/0 pallet adapters (MFICORP DAAA09-92-C-0480); the MK 14/3 cartridge tank lid (Aggressive Engr (DAAA09-92-C-0549 and DAAA09-92-C-0560). Problems created were higher cost; previous producer fails pre-award because of qual system and capable producer fails pre-award due to increased cost of requirements.

4/93 AMCCOM (QAM) - Provided an issue paper on AMCCOM policy when to use MIL-Q vs MIL-I. In 1990 QAM official policy mandated MIL-Q and SPC on any PPI having a critical or special characteristic.

PQMs do not use the Navy MIPR's when they develop the Section E requirement. The PPI only references the PRON. Even if a PQM had the relevant MIPR input he would be unable to match the PPI to that MIPR. Contract DAAA09-92-C-0366, MK 1102 pallet adapter, was a MIL-I contract. The SMCA is trying to minimize the use of MIL-I. If the Navy considers the current practice to be counterproductive, recommend they submit a list of MIL-I candidates to QAM. The Navy PAT group had no problem with the QAM policy presented and all agreed to close this action.

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 71-193

REQ COMPLETION DATE: JUL 93

ISSUE/PROBLEM: Reinstatement of the Annual Configuration Identification Procurement Planning (CIPPS) Meeting.

STATUS: OPEN: MONITOR: CLOSED: XXX

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: JOHN PIERCY

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

1/93 NSWC Crane (402) - Reinstate the annual CIPPS meeting for 2T ammunition. Target date April 1993.

1/93 NWAC PMTC - Coordinate with the 2E activities to institute an annual Procurement Planning meeting similar to the 2T CIPPS meeting.

4/93 NWAC PMTC - Action of 1/93 remains open.

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

1/93 AMCCOM (PD) - Submitted an issue paper from PDM-M requesting that the formal CIPPS meeting be reinstated. The need is there for better Navy stock status/availability information. Additionally, since AMCCOM is going through a RIF new personnel will be assigned to Navy items. PDM-M recommended the meeting be held at NSWC Crane since all cognizance engineers are there. PD should support the meeting with 1 knowledgeable production manager from each commodity area. The meeting should be held in April each year in order to properly assign component sources prior to final budget lock. The April 1993 meeting would be conducted in support of the FY 95 program.

4/93 NSWC Crane (402) - Stated the 2T planning meeting is scheduled for 26-27 April 1993.

7/93 NSWC Crane (402) - Discussed the results of the 2T CIPPS meeting in April 1993. All went well and an annual spring meeting will continue to be held for 2T ammo. The PAT group agreed to close this action.

7/93 PMTC - Stated no meeting was necessary for 2E ammo.

**2E/2T ACQUISITION PROCUREMENT/PRODUCTION
PROCESS ACTION TEAM (PAT)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 72-193 **REQ COMPLETION DATE:** OCT 93

ISSUE/PROBLEM: Reinstatement of the Annual Program Review.

STATUS: OPEN: MONITOR: CLOSED: XXX

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: SABRA BROWN
 JOHN WILDRIDGE
 JOHN NIEHAUS

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

1/93 NSWC Crane (402)/AMCCOM (PD) - Further investigate the need for an annual Program Review for 2T ammunition. Summarize what the agenda for this meeting would be, who needs to participate and report recommendations at next meeting.

1/93 PMTC/AMCCOM (PD) - Further investigate the need for an annual Program Review for 2E ammunition. Summarize what the agenda for this meeting would be, who needs to participate and report recommendations at next meeting.

4/93 NSWC Crane (402)/AMCCOM (PD)/PMTC - Action of 1/93 remains open.

7/93 AMCCOM (PDM) - Publish a proposed agenda for the annual Program/Commodity Review. List the items and topics to be discussed. The 2E and 2T should be separated meetings. Depending on the audience of the review meeting, brief the "AMCCOM Generation of Lead Times/FDPS" as briefed to the PAT on 7/93.

9/93 NSWC Crane (402, PM4A)/AMCCOM (PD) - Set up a Pyro Program Review at Crane in October 1993. Participants are to be CAAA, Crane (402, 404, PM415) and AMCCOM (QAM, PD) as a minimum. Remove the Pyro items from the currently scheduled Program Review 2-4 November at AMCCOM.

9/93 NSWC Crane (402) - Report the results/benefits of the October 1993 Pyro meeting for potential future joint reviews with other producers and AMCCOM for other commodities.

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

1/93 AMCCOM (PD) - Submitted an issue paper from PDM-M stating that there are discrepancies between completed programs and actual program status. In addition, the number of production problem resolution conferences have increased demonstrating the need for an annual production status review. PDM-M recommended

ACTION # 72-193 (CONTINUED)

an annual "program status review" be formally reinstated to be held at AMCCOM in the November 1993 time frame. It is not to be a MIPR review as in the past in that financial status will not be discussed. Fixed standard price has negated this need.

7/93 AMCCOM (PDM) - The annual Program/Commodity Review meeting is set for 19-21 October 1993. It will be like a commodity review with no financial data discussed. The 2E and 2T will probably be split meetings.

7/93 PMTC - Stated there was a need for 2E to participate in the AMCCOM Program/Commodity Review.

9/93 AMCCOM (PD) - Stated a 2T/2E Program Review meeting was scheduled for 2-4 November 1993 at AMCCOM.

1/94 NSWC (PM4A, 402) - Provided their opinion of how the Pyro/Demo program review went at Crane in Nov 93. Basically the meeting was beneficial to have with the main LAP facility but the coordination/agenda for this particular meeting had been poor. Additionally, the meeting at AMCCOM on all other commodities was very useful based on discussions from other Crane personnel and the who had attended the meeting and the AMCCOM chairman of the meeting himself.

1/94 AMCCOM (PDM) - Recommended that all future program review meetings be done at AMCCOM, including pyro/demo, to get more upper AMCCOM management involved in the reviews. The LAP facilities and who ever the PM feels needs to be there can be invited. The PAT group agreed to close this action.

**2E/2T ACQUISITION PROCUREMENT/PRODUCTION
PROCESS ACTION TEAM (PAT)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 73-193

REQ COMPLETION DATE: APR 93

ISSUE/PROBLEM: NAVAIR's procedure for processing Engineering Change Proposals (ECPs).

STATUS:	OPEN:	MONITOR:	CLOSED: XXX
----------------	-------	----------	--------------------

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: CARL LOUCK

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

1/93 PMTC - Coordinate with PMA-201 to define and resolve the NAVAIR ECP process problems identified in AMCCOM (PDM-CA) issue paper of January 1993.

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

1/93 AMCCOM (PDM-CA) - Submitted an issue paper stating the SMCA has experienced a lack of timely response by the NAVAIR engineering community in processing ECPs. The process has resulted in prolonged breaks in production and subsequent program delinquencies. PDM-CA recommended the Navy PAT evaluate the process and attempt to streamline it. Also recommended the Navy develop a policy to provide written guidance to new contractors on the proper method of submitting ECPs to NAVAIR. Require mandatory post-award meetings with new contractors for the purpose of discussing the ECP and other Navy peculiar issues.

4/93 PMTC - Reported that concurrent reviews of NAVAIR ECP procedures are being conducted by both the PM for Tactical Strike Weapons and the Field Activity (NAWC, ISEA). After much discussion by the PAT the problem appeared to be within AMCCOM and not within the NAVAIR community. The PAT group decided to close this action but to have the AMCCOM internal PAT, identified in action 55-1091, investigate the AMCCOM process for getting QA requirements, CDRLs and other Navy deliverable requirements to the GOCO and GOGOs and compare this process to that for COCOs.

**2E/2T ACQUISITION PROCUREMENT/PRODUCTION
PROCESS ACTION TEAM (PAT)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 74-193 **REQ COMPLETION DATE:** SEPT 93

ISSUE/PROBLEM: Delivery of the MK 90 Propellant Grain is delinquent. It is GFM to the 2.75 Hydra Rocket Motor produced by BEI in Camden, Arkansas. NSW Indian Head produces the Grain.

STATUS: OPEN: MONITOR: CLOSED: xxx

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: LIZ EAGLES

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

1/93 NSW IH - Investigate the MK 90 Propellant Grain delivery/schedule problems with AMCCOM and identify the process to fix the problem at the next meeting.

4/93 NSW IH - Action of 1/93 remains open.

7/93 NSW IH - Action of 1/93 remains open.

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

1/93 AMCCOM (PDM-C) - Submitted an issue paper from PDM-D providing the past history of NSW Indian Head lack of communication and slow response to MIPRs from AMCCOM. PDM-D recommended NSW Indian Head be tasked to provide realistic delivery schedules they can actually meet and provide a get well plan on delinquent deliveries. Requested verbal and written communication from NSW Indian Head.

9/93 ALL - The group agreed to close this action as it is OBE.

**2E/2T ACQUISITION PROCUREMENT/PRODUCTION
PROCESS ACTION TEAM (PAT)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 75-193 **REQ COMPLETION DATE:** APR 93

ISSUE/PROBLEM: All Navy ALNs require an Interfix Number of "001".

STATUS: OPEN: MONITOR: CLOSED: XXX

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: BRAD SITZ

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

1/93 AMCCOM (QAM) - Identify exactly what problems are created when the Navy always uses Interfix Number "001" in their ALNs.

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

1/93 AMCCOM (QAM) - Submitted an issue paper from QAD-I requesting the Navy change their policy of always using Interfix Number "001" when assigning ammunition lot numbers (ALN). It suggested that this policy defeated the purpose of paragraph 4.1.4 of MIL-STD-1168A. QAD-I stated the Ammunition Lot Record and Malfunction System (ALRAM) searching ability is hindered by this Navy policy since one of the primary search keys is the Interfix Number. Discussion followed in which the Group could not identify that the issue paper presented a problem. It did present a difference between the Navy and Army policy but why that difference creates a problem was not recognizable.

4/93 AMCCOM (QAM) - Provided updated issue paper stating QAD has provided a follow up memo outlining some of the systemic problems created by the Navy always using interfix # 001. All agreed to close this action for the PAT.

**2E/2T ACQUISITION PROCUREMENT/PRODUCTION
PROCESS ACTION TEAM (PAT)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 76-493 **REQ COMPLETION DATE:**

ISSUE/PROBLEM: AMCCOM problems with retaining a Proven Producer

STATUS: **OPEN:** **MONITOR:** **CLOSED:XXX**

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: JAN ISENBERG

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

4/93 AMCCOM (PC) - Brief the PAT on the specific problems AMCCOM has with retaining a proven producer. This action came from action 63-492 on the MK 79/80 signal but the action is not specific to this signal.

7/93 AMCCOM (PC) - Action of 4/93 remains open.

9/93 AMCCOM (PC) - Action of 4/93 remains open.

1/94 AMCCOM (PAA) - Action of 4/93 remains open.

4/94 AMCCOM (PAA) - Action of 4/93 remains open.

6/94 AMCCOM (PAA) - Action of 4/93 remains open.

10/94 AMCCOM (PAA) - Action of 4/93 remains open.

1/95 AMCCOM (PAA) - Action of 4/93 remains open.

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

4/95 AMCCOM (PAA) - Briefed the group on retaining proven producers. Contracting without full and open competition is a violation of statute, unless permitted by one of the following 7 exceptions: only 1 responsible source to satisfy agency requirements; unusual & compelling urgency; industrial mob; international agreement; authorized or required by statute; national security; or public interest. Contraction without providing for full and open competition shall not be justified on the basis of: (1) a lack of advance planning; (2) concerns

related to the amount of funds e.g. expiring funds. When not providing for full and open competition, the PCO shall solicit offers from as many potential sources as is possible. Examples of acquisition strategies are: PIC performance incentive contracting; best value process; evaluated/unevaluated option for increased qty; multi year contracts; reserved specified base industrial base; or small business 8a program. All agreed to close this action.

**2E/2T ACQUISITION PROCUREMENT/PRODUCTION
PROCESS ACTION TEAM (PAT)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 77-493 **REQ COMPLETION DATE:** APR 94

ISSUE/PROBLEM: Advance funds required by Navy Test Activities for SOPs/Fixturing/matl for LAT/FAT.

STATUS: **OPEN:** **MONITOR:** **CLOSED:** XXX

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: SCOTT RIDEOUT

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

4/93 AMCCOM (QAM; PD) - Investigate sending Navy test activities advance LAT/FAT funds for SOPs/fixturing/matl. Issue paper submitted by NSWC Crane (405) in March 1993.

7/93 WPNSTA Earle - Sample the following test activities (Dahlgren (G-61), Crane (405) and Earle) to assure advance LAT/FAT funds are getting to the activities when needed.

9/93 WPNSTA Earle - Action of 7/93 remains open.

1/94 WPNSTA Earle - Follow up with Dahlgren (G-61) to see if they are also getting advance LAT/FAT test funds early enough to buy fixturing/matl/write SOPs and etc. If so this action can be closed at the next meeting.

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

7/93 AMCCOM (QAM) - Stated that advance LAT/FAT funds can be and will be sent to the Navy test activities as required but only after a solicitation is issued.

1/94 WPNSTA Earle - Stated they had sent a letter to Crane (405), Dahlgren (G-61) and talked locally to Earle as to whether these

test Activities were getting advance LAT/FAT funds for fixturing/matl and SOPs. Crane and Earle stated they were getting advance funds but Dahlgren had not responded yet. AMCCOM (PDM-M) also said the test activities could ask for LAT/FAT test equipment as a normal cost estimate to QAM and that a larger item could be bought to support several commodities/procurement items. In fact it was easier to spread the cost across several items as long as they were all from the same PM.

4/94 Earle - Stated that Dahlgren (G-61) is getting advance LAT/FAT funds to buy fixturing/matl/write SOPs and etc. All agreed to close this action.

**2E/2T ACQUISITION PROCUREMENT/PRODUCTION
PROCESS ACTION TEAM (PAT)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 78-493 **REQ COMPLETION DATE:** MAY 96

ISSUE/PROBLEM: AMCCOM Internal PAT to review the process to assure MIPR clauses, PDP requirements, distribution requirements and related issues are being complied with on Navy MIPRs.

STATUS: **OPEN:** **MONITOR:** **CLOSED:** XXX

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: RON BREAKER

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

4/93 AMCCOM (DSS) - Establish an AMCCOM internal PAT between PD, PC, QAM, DS and BAT to review the process within AMCCOM. The intent is to assure MIPR clauses, PDP requirements, distribution requirements and related issues are being complied with on Navy MIPRs.

4/93 AMCCOM (DSS) - Brief the PAT on the AMCCOM process for getting QA requirements/CDRLs and other Navy requirements to GOCO and GOGO activities vs COCOs.

7/93 AMCCOM (DSS) - Continue to report the progress of the AMCCOM internal PAT. Try to relate actions/progress to the PAT 3 action items when applicable.

7/93 AMCCOM (QAM) - Sample QA requirements that are separate from the PDP, and are sent to the GOGOs, GOCOs and COCOs. Report how the QA requirements are issued to these plants. Also report how and if the requirements are being implemented differently at the

various plants.

9/93 AMCCOM (DSS) - Continue to report the progress of the AMCCOM internal PAT. Brief PAT 3 on the process defined by the internal PAT, "receipt of the MIPR until the item is on contract".

9/93 AMCCOM (QAM) - Action of 7/93 remains open.

1/94 AMCCOM (DSS) - Action of 9/93 remains open.

1/94 AMCCOM (QAM) - Action of 7/93 remains open.

4/94 AMCCOM (QAM) - Brief the PAT on QAM/QAD/etc involvement at GOGOs/GOCOs.

4/94 AMCCOM (DS) - Continue to report the progress of the AMCCOM internal PAT.

4/94 AMCCOM (PD/DS) - Forward a copy of the "major item plan" (603 plan) to BAT with the acceptance of all MIPRs.

6/94 AMCCOM (DS) - Continue to report the progress of the AMCCOM internal PAT.

ACTION #78-493 (CONTINUED)

10/94 AMCCOM (DS) - Action of 6/94 remains open.

1/95 AMCCOM (DS) - Action of 6/94 remains open.

4/95 AMCCOM (DS) - Action of 6/94 remains open. Due Nov 95 after IOC is stood up and changes are made internal to AMCCOM/IOC.

2/96 IOC (SMA-D) - Determine if the IOC internal PAT, defined 4/93 above, will be reactivated with the reorganization of the IOC.

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

7/93 AMCCOM (DSS) - Reported the results of the first AMCCOM internal PAT meeting of June 1993. Members include PC, BAT, NVLNO, PD, QAM and DSS. The team is now charting the process flow. Specific problems encountered are to cross reference the MIPR to the PRON and tracking the change of shipping destination.

9/93 AMCCOM (DSS) - Reported the internal PAT has identified the internal AMCCOM process from "receipt of the MIPR until the item is put on contract". Very good participation has been achieved and all seemed to be learning a great deal from the meetings. The internal PAT is currently working on the MIPR clause piece of the process. Per the NVLNO, advance notification of CCBs appears to be a problem.

4/94 AMCCOM (DS) - Briefed the process that the internal AMCCOM PAT had documented for MIPR processing. Also provided CDRLs problems they had identified. **FACTS:** MIPR includes the ident of

PDP which states the CDRL requirements, copy of MIPR sent to contr data mgt team (BAT) when accepted, MIPR does not ident PRON, BAT responsible for CDRL into PPI, PPI includes PRON but not MIPR #. **PROBLEM:** BAT could not relate MIPR TO PRON.

SOLUTION: BAT utilize on line automated system to relate PRON to MIPR. Service include CDRL reqs in TDP.

6/94 AMCCOM (PDM) - Has provided a MIPR to PRON relational file to the BAT code in AMCCOM. Data was extracted from the CISCA data system. PDM will continue to give this to BAT in the future.

6/94 AMCCOM (QAM) - Briefed the group on QA requirements that are separate from the PDP and are sent to GOGOs, GOCOs and COCOs.

For COCOs, the QA provisions are written into the section E of the solicitation/contract. Navy's mandatory PVIs are attached to the QALI and forwarded to the QAR.

ACTION #78-493 (CONTINUED)

For GOCOs, the generic QA requirements (MIL-Q, SPC clause, etc.) are in section E (prepared by QAD not QAM) of the contract.

The SOW contains the specific requirements e.g. AIE, RFD, ECP submissions and PVI requirements. QAM does not issue QALIs. Basic load plant contracts are 5 year cost plus incentive contracts.

For GOGOs, they are workloaded by PDM via PRONS. These activities do not have basic contracts. Local SOPs establish QA provisions. They do not have CDRLs to respond to. QAM does not issue any QALIs or generic guidance to GOGOs. QAM does provide guidance and clarification when requested by the plant. QAM does not conduct any product detection or verification inspections at GOGOs. This is done locally.

5/95 ALL - Suggested this action be placed on hold until Oct 95 after the new IOC is stood up.

6/96 ALL - The PAT agreed to close this action at this time. Additionally, per IOE-A letter of 10 Jun 96 the IOC has no standing PAT as this one as well as others had been dissolved.

**2E/2T ACQUISITION STANDING WORKING GROUP
(SWG)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 79-493 **REQ COMPLETION DATE:** AUG 97

ISSUE/PROBLEM: Lack of understanding the Gage Process

STATUS: **OPEN:** **MONITOR:** **CLOSED:** XXX

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: JERRY LAPOINTE

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

4/93 NWAC (MS-16) - Provide the proposed 2T gage process to all the PAT technical agents and PM4 for review (target date 10 May 1993).

4/93 NWAC (MS-26/MS-16) - Brief the entire Navy gage process at the next meeting.

7/93 NWAC (MS-16/MS-26) - Update the NAVSEA Gage instruction and submit it to PM4 via Crane (402) to be published as a PM4 policy letter. Get format of policy letter from 402.

7/93 NWAC (MS-16) - Provide gage process brief to PM4 CMs and Crane (402) prior to 1 October 1993. Specifically address the typical flow for 2T ammo.

7/93 NWAC (MS-16) - Investigate the use of computer software to see if some exists to assist in evaluating component interface.

7/93 NWAC (MS-16) - Build in the gage process into the overall Acquisition Process Model (provide input to Robin Meyers to

accomplish)

7/93 PMTC (P2609) - Investigate if and where NAVAIR gage requirements are defined. Should a similar policy letter (NWAC action of 7/93) be issued for the NAVAIR community?

9/93 PMTC (P2609) - Action of 7/93 remains open.

9/93 NWAC (MS-16/MS-26) - Update the NAVSEA Gage instruction and submit it to PM4 via Crane (402) to be published as a PM4 policy letter. Get format of policy letter from 402.

9/93 NWAC (MS-16) - Provide gage process brief to Crane (404). Specifically address the typical flow for 2E ammo.

9/93 NWAC (MS-16) - Investigate the use of computer software to see if some exists to assist in evaluating component interface.

9/93 NWAC (MS-16) - Build in the gage process into the overall Acquisition Process Model (provide input to Robin Meyers to accomplish).

1/94 NWAC (MS-16) - Provide gage process brief to Crane (404).

ACTION # 79-493 (CONTINUED)

Specifically address the typical flow for 2E ammo. This action remains from 9/93.

1/94 NWAC (MS-16) - Build in the gage process into the overall Acquisition Process Model (provide input to Robin Meyers to accomplish). This action remains from 9/93.

1/94 PMTC (P2609)/NWAC (MS-26) - Investigate if and where NAVAIR gage requirements are defined. Should a similar policy letter (NWAC action of 7/93) be issued for the NAVAIR community? This action remains open from 9/93.

4/94 NWAD (MS-16)/NSWCC (402) - Rewrite the 2T gage G & P paper to incorporate the interface of all players, e.g. AEA/ISEA/DAs/NWAD/PM4/ETC, as proposed by NSWCC (402). Provide PMTC (P2609) & MS-26 the rewrite by mid May 94. MS-16 brief the completed 2T G & P paper at the next PAT meeting.

4/94 PMTC(P2609)/NWAD (MS-26) - At the next PAT meeting, provide status of proposed NAVAIR Gage G & P paper which had been coordinated with the MS-16 2T paper.

6/94 NWAD (MS-16) - Distribute the 2T Physical Interface Control G&P paper, provided to the PAT 6/94, to the 2T DAs for review/concurrence.

6/94 NWAD (MS-26) - Coordinate proposed NAVAIR Physical Interface Control instruction, provided to the PAT 6/94, with the appropriate NAVAIR Engineering Agents for review/concurrence.

6/94 NWAD (MS-26/16) - Brief the PAT on the similarities and differences between the proposed 2T G&P and the proposed NAVAIR Physical Interface Control Instruction.

10/94 NWAD (MS-16) - Following 2T DA comments of the 2T G&P for

Physical Interface Control, forward final G&P to PM4 for signature. (due Dec 94)

10/94 NWAD (MS-26) - Coordinate proposed NAVAIR Physical Interface Control and Verification instruction, provided to the PAT 10/94, with the appropriate NAVAIR Engineering Agents for review/concurrence. (Brief results to the PAT)

1/95 NSWC CR (PM4A) - Issue the Physical Interface Control G & P to the 2T community after final chop by PM4.

1/95 NWAD (MS-26) - Action of 10/94 remains open.

4/95 NWAD (MS-26) - Action of 10/94 remains open.

7/95 NWAD (MS-26) - Action of 10/94 remains open.

2/96 NWAD (MS-26) - Action of 10/94 remains open yet. Now holds the PAT record as the longest open action/task.

6/96 NWAD (MS-21) - Action of 10/94 remains open yet.

10/96 NWAD (MS-21) - Action of 10/94 remains open yet.

3/97 NWAD (MS-21) - Action of 10/94 remains open yet. Will no longer carry this as an action after aug 97 complete or not.

ACTION # 79-493 (CONTINUED)

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

7/93 NWAC (MS-16) - Briefed the entire Navy gage interface process. A block flow diagram with backup verbiage was provided.

The process was not provided to the PAT technical agents prior to the brief. Proposed improvements to the gage process were also presented.

9/93 NWAC (MS-16) - Stated they had briefed Crane (PM4, 402) in August 1993 on the gage process. There will no longer be a SECNAV INSTR on the special interface control program as NAVSEA decided not to forward the proposed INSTR that Crane (402, PM4) had commented on in the September 1993 PM4 letter.

1/94 NWAC (MS-16) - Stated the NAVSEA Gage instruction has been updated as a PM4 policy letter and was forwarded to Crane (402) in December 93. Also stated computer software to support component interface was looked into and this action should be dropped from a formal action with which the PAT members agreed.

4/94 NSWCC (402) - Stated the action of 1/94 for NWAD to brief Crane (404) was no longer a requirement as 402 and 404 are now combined and 402 had already been briefed. 4025 also briefed the PAT on their review of the 2T interface control G & P paper which had been provided by MS-16 in late Dec 93. Recommended the paper be rewritten to incorporate the interfaces of the AEA/DAs/ISEA also and not just PM4 and NWAD. Recommended, and PM4 agreed, 402 should get involved in the rewrite.

4/94 PMTC (P2609) - Stated there is no NAVAIR policy on gages documented but it needs to be. They will investigate how to

document the policy, maybe similar to the 2T community, and report the status at the next PAT meeting.

6/94 NSWC (402) - Briefed the group on the efforts of Crane (402) and NWAD (MS-16) to come up with a 2T Physical Interface Control G&P paper. The draft G&P would be forwarded to the 2T DAs for review. It will then be submitted to PM4 for signature.

6/94 NWAD (MS-26) - Passed out a proposed NAVAIR instruction for Physical Interface Control. The instruction had not been sent to the other AIR activities for concurrence yet.

10/94 NWAD (MS-16) - Stated the 2T Physical Interface Control G&P has been sent to all 2T DAs but not all response has been received yet.

ACTION #79-493 (CONTINUED)

10/94 NWAD (MS-26) - Handed out an updated proposed NAVAIR instruction for Physical Interface Control and Verification (latest draft 10/4/94). It is in its final stages of development. It identifies 17 tasks and processes usable for Interface Control and Verification. It has not been sent out to NAVAIR tech agents for review yet. Also discussed the similarities and differences between the 2T G&P and the proposed NAVAIR instruction. Appears NAWC uses NWAD to support them in their acquisition agent/ISEA role as well. Other NAVAIR technical agents do not use NWAD the same as NAWC.

1/95 NWAD (MS-16) - Reported the 2T Physical Interface Control G&P was forwarded to PM4 in Jan 94 for final review and signature.

4/95 NSWC CR (PM4A) - Stated the 2T Physical Interface Control G&P had been signed and promulgated by PM4 on 6 Apr 95.

6/96 NWAD (MS-21) - (MS-21) formerly (MS-26) stated the proposed NAVAIR instruction for Physical Interface Control and Verification is out for review to PMTC.

10/96 NWAD (MS-21) - Stated there has been more action taken within the AIR community, specifically a lot more interaction with PMTC, but the document is not signed out yet but they expect it will be by Feb 97.

3/97 NWAD (MS-21) - Document still being finalized. Building in ISO 9000.

8/97 NWAD (MS-21) - Stated the document is still being reviewed by NAWC but it will get done and NWAD will inform the group when it finally gets published but it. The group decided to close

this action as stated in the 3/97 action.

**2E/2T ACQUISITION PROCUREMENT/PRODUCTION
PROCESS ACTION TEAM (PAT)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 80-793 **REQ COMPLETION DATE:** JAN 94

ISSUE/PROBLEM: Do MIPRs need to be amended each time an ADL Change Notice is issued?

STATUS: OPEN: MONITOR: CLOSED: XXX

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: DOUG MORRELL

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

7/93 NSWC (402) - Form an ad hoc working group to review the linkage between the MIPR and the ADL Change Notice. Can we stop amending MIPRs each time an ADL-CN is issued? Working group members should include SPCC, AMCCOM (DSS), PMTC, Earle and Crane (404) as we need a consistent policy for both SEA and AIR.

9/93 AMCCOM (DSS) - Investigate if the current 2T practice of "not amending MIPRs every time an ADL-CN is issued" is causing any problems. What is the impact if any, if all Navy were to adopt this practice?

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

7/93 NSWC Crane (402) - Provided an issue paper to open this action. Stated the Crane ADL instruction was updated in

May 1991. The revision does not require a change in ADL revision when an ADL-CN is issued. The ADL revision stays the same revision for the life of the contract. The ADL-CN is annotated in the remarks section of the data card in the same manner as a waiver or a deviation. Recommended when Crane (402) issues a ADL-CN an information copy should be provided to SPCC not a dual addressed letter and SPCC should not issue a MIPR amendment. 9/93 NSWC Crane (402) - Reported no ad hoc working group had ever met per the 7/93 action, nor were they sure they still needed one.

1/94 AMCCOM (DSS) - Provided a brief sheet on whether the MIPR needs to be changed each time an ADL-CN is issued. It stated procurement, product assurance and the technical offices within AMCCOM were queried for their comments. Their response indicated that amendments to MIPRs are only required when a change is significant such as a part number or NSN change. Also the Production Office is not always on distribution for ADL-CN's and they need to be added. The PAT group assured that the Production Office within AMCCOM was on distribution for ADL-CN's and that

ACTION # 80-793 (CONTINUED)

MIPR amendments are not needed everytime an ADL-CN is issued.

Pat members also stated that when an NSN or similar was changed at a minimum the MIPR was amended. The members agreed to close this action.

**2E/2T ACQUISITION PROCUREMENT/PRODUCTION
PROCESS ACTION TEAM (PAT)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 81-793 **REQ COMPLETION DATE:** APR 94

ISSUE/PROBLEM: How will Navy TDPs be Certified free of Ozone Depleting Substances. Who will sign the Certification or any necessary Waivers.

STATUS: OPEN: MONITOR: CLOSED: XXX

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: CARL LOUCK

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

7/93 AMCCOM (PC)/NVLNO - Formally identify to the Navy what the AMCCOM policy is on certifying TPDs free from Ozone Depleting Substances. What documentation is required from the Navy to certify a PDP? How many tiers of documents within the specs need to be reviewed? What is the AMCCOM policy on submitting waivers to the Ozone requirement when necessary?

9/93 AMCCOM (PC)/NVLNO - Action of 7/93 remains open with the addition that AMCCOM needs to document their answers to each of the 7/93 actions/questions to alleviate any confusion.

1/94 PMTC (P2609) - Investigate the overall Navy and the NAVAIR policy on certifying TDPs free from ozone depleting substances. Who can certify TDPs and how many levels of a document must be reviewed? Report the findings at the next PAT meeting.

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

7/93 NSWCC Crane (402) - Stated they were recently told by AMCCOM that, by Congressional law, after 1 June 1993 all ammo contracts must use TDPs that are certified free from Ozone Depleting Substances or must have a waiver signed by a flag officer/SES. The intent within 2T ammo is to have Crane (402) certify all TDPs are free from Ozone Depleting Substances and not to have to issue any waivers. Crane (402) intends to add a statement to the PDP to certify it. The question still remains, how many tiers of documents within the specs need to be reviewed to certify the TDP.

7/93 PMTC - Stated the NAVAIR position for 2E ammo was to require all TDPs be certified or waived by NAVAIR headquarters. PMTC felt the certification could also be handled by the technical activity as intended for 2T ammo.

ACTION #81-793 (CONTINUED)

9/93 NVLNO - Stated Mr Morgan had been contacted but no AMCCOM policy/decision had been written down yet per action of 7/93.

1/94 AMCCOM (PAA)/NVLNO - No official policy would be provided by AMCCOM. The group was clear that per OSD direction an SES/flag officer's signature was required when a waiver to the ODS requirement was needed. The question still remains who can certify a TDP free of ozone depleting substances and to what level must the specs be reviewed. The 2T community does have an established process/policy that is acceptable to AMCCOM. The 2E community is still uncertain as to their policy. The group agreed to close the action for AMCCOM as it may raise more questions than it would answer.

4/94 PMTC - Stated the NAVAIR position for 2E ammo has now changed on this issue. NAVAIR no longer requires headquarters to sign that the TDP is certified free of ozone depleting substances. What the 2E community is doing as was the case with the 2T community is acceptable to the SMCA. All agreed to close

this action

**2E/2T ACQUISITION PROCUREMENT/PRODUCTION
PROCESS ACTION TEAM (PAT)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 82-194 **REQ COMPLETION DATE:** FEB 94

ISSUE/PROBLEM: Weapon containers with polyethylene foam may contain explosive concentrations of isobutane vapor which may explode when opened, manufactured or maintained. A warning to weapons container manufacturers, handlers and PMs was issued in Nov 93 by Earle and the NOC but the 2E/2T PMs and tech agents were unsure of actions taken or needed.

STATUS: OPEN: MONITOR: CLOSED: XXX

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: JOHN WILDRIDGE

CARL LOUCK
DAVE TREFFINGER
SCOTT RIDEOUT

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

1/94 NSWC (402, 404)/ PMTC (P2609)/ Earle - For your cog items, investigate if the Earle letter of 16 Nov 93 and the NOC msg of 10 Nov 93 impacts the 2T/2E ammunition. Identify what action if any needs to be taken by either the appropriate PM or technical agent. (Target date 15 Feb 94)

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

4/94 PMTC (P2609) - Stated the polyethylene foam was not an issue for PMA-201.

4/94 NSWC (402) - Had approx 132 items with foam packaging but the issue was not a show stopper for 2T ammo. There is a committee working on changing the MIL-SPECS for foam.

4/94 Earle - Passed out a 1994 NOC msg again addressing the issue but all agreed it was not a problem to comply with the NOC requirements. The PAT agreed to close this issue.

**2E/2T ACQUISITION STANDING WORKING GROUP
(SWG)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 83-194 **REQ COMPLETION DATE:** AUG 97

ISSUE/PROBLEM: Lack of seals on individual containers within a wire bound box. Individual containers require seals when issued after the wire bound box is opened yet are not sealed coming off the production line.

STATUS: OPEN: MONITOR: CLOSED: XXX

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: EARL HUMPHRIES

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

1/94 NVLNO - Report the results of PAT 4 towards standardizing the process of putting seals on all individual containers within a wire bound box. Has the issue been elevated to the JOCG to put seals on all individual containers as they come off the production/maintenance lines.

4/94 NVLNO - Check with QAS to verify how the Army is dealing with sealed containers. Would it be a cost/labor savings for the Army RSS&I inspection effort if all containers inside a wire bound box were sealed at the time of manufacture?

4/94 Earle - Report the status of the JOCG Packaging and Handling Subgroup's efforts to address the need to seal individual containers within a wire bound box at the time of manufacture. Assure the Subgroup addresses all ongoing sealing changes/requirements and attempts to standardizes them.

6/94 AMCCOM (QAM) - Report the results of the JOCG/QA Subgroup action to get Army engineering/etc to require traceable seals at the unit pack (metal box) level for Army developed items e.g. small arms. Seals were to be applied at the time of manufacture.

6/94 Earle - Action of 4/94 remains open.

10/94 AMCCOM (QAM) - Action of 6/94 remains open yet.

10/94 Earle - Action of 4/94 remains open yet.

1/95 Earle - Action of 4/94 remains open. JOCG Packaging and Handling Subgroup is to meet in Feb 95.

1/95 AMCCOM (QAM) - Action of 6/94 remains open.

4/95 AMCCOM (QAM) - Report the **final** results of the JOCG/QA Subgroup action to get Army engineering/etc to require traceable

ACTION # 83-194 (CONTINUED)

seals at the unit pack (metal box) level for Army developed items e.g. small arms. Seals were to be applied at the time of manufacture.

4/95 Earle - Report the status of the JOCG Packaging and Handling Subgroup's efforts to address the need to seal individual containers within a wire bound box at the time of manufacture. Assure the Subgroup addresses all ongoing sealing changes/requirements and attempts to standardizes them.

7/95 Earle - Investigate with the JOCG Packaging and Handling Subgroup if there are any ongoing efforts to address standardization of sealing techniques and requirements e.g. use aluminum seals in place of lead.

7/95 AMCCOM (QAM) -Action of 4/95 remains open. Due to PM4A 1 Sep 95.

7/95 NSWC CR (PM4A) - Write a letter to the NOC requesting they forward a letter to the SMCA CG requesting implementation of seals on individual containers within wire bound boxes. Only do this after contacting AMCCOM QA (Coordinate with QAM action of 7/95) and verifying the issue is still not resolved within the QA and Engineering groups at AMCCOM.

2/96 Earle - Action of 7/95 remains open yet. Also brief the PAT on the results of the 6 - 7 Feb 96 Seal Symposium in CA which Earle attended. What issues are significant to the PAT?

2/96 IOC (IOE-A) - Check with the JOCG QA subgroup chairman to assure they are going to monitor the 50 cal, 7.62mm and 5.56mm produced at Lake City and eventually require traceable seals on the metal cans of other small arms ammunition calibers. This should be on their FY 96/97 QA plan.

6/96 Earle & IOC (IOE-A) - Both actions of 2/96 remain open.

10/96 Earle - Submit an ECP to AMSDA ACALA (formerly ARDEC) recommending the elimination of lead in all traceable seals for DOD. Provide of implementation status at the next meeting.

3/97 Earle - Action of 10/96 remains open. Refer to 3/97 action taken.

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

1/94 - The lack of lead wire or etc seals on individual containers within a wire bound box was brought up because the In-Service community, (receipt, segregation & issue) is spending a lot of funds sealing individual containers once they are removed from a wire bound box. These items could have been sealed coming off the production line for little or no cost. These items are primarily Army developed items and it should be a JOCG standard to seal all containers as it would save all Services O&M funds.

ACTION # 83-194 (CONTINUED)

4/94 NVLNO - Reported the Air Force and Marine Corps was contacted on the sealing issue. It does not affect the AF and the MC doesn't care because the Navy handles the RSS&I effort for them. An Army military was also talked to who stated the Army opened all boxes when received even if they were sealed. Other members of the PAT stated QAS or DS should be asked instead as they were trying to save money and this sure appeared to be a way to do so.

6/94 Earle - Stated the Packaging and Handling Subgroup had not addressed the sealing issue as they are not meeting until Aug 94. It would then be addressed.

6/94 NSWC Crane (PM4A) - Stated PM4A had presented an issued paper to the JOCG/QA Subgroup in May 94. The paper was provided to the PAT members. The paper requested AMCCOM require traceable

seals at the unit pack (metal box) level for Army developed items e.g. small arms ammo. All Services had agreed with the paper. At the Subgroup meeting the Services were tasked to identify the DODICs needing sealed and PM4 was to provide some WPNSTA cost savings data to AMCCOM QA as supporting data. QA would then take the issue up within AMCCOM and make it a requirement. PM4A also provided a NOC letter of 9 June 94 on ordnance sealing requirements within the Navy. The letter further supports the need for better sealing requirements during procurement. Also stated, per some of the Navy documentation personnel, the Army is trying to go to a twist wire in place of lead/aluminum wire seals which is the opposite to the Navy's direction. It is very important for the JOCG/Packaging and Handling Subgroup to address the whole issue of traceable seals and to try to standardize sealing requirements as the current process will continue to waste the Service's in-service funds.

10/94 Earle - Stated the JOCG Packaging and Handling subgroup had not met yet. Also stated ARDEC said they were directed by AMCCOM to put seals on small arms boxes. This was confusing to several members of the PAT because of what was reported below by PM4A/NVLNO.

10/94 NSWC Crane (PM4A) - Showed the group a memo from the NVLNO stating various codes at AMCCOM had met and decided the Navy needed to write a letter to AMCCOM (PD) requesting they implement a new procedure at Lake City AAP to install a traceable seal on the metal M2A1 container. Members at the meeting had been reps from QA, DS, JS, NVLNO and MCLNO-LMA non of which had been at the JOCG/QA Subgroup meeting where the issue had been presented.

ACTION # 83-194 (CONTINUED)

PM4A had since contacted QA to ask them if the fact that the QA director, also the chairman of the JOCG/QA Subgroup, had officially taken the action ment anything? The point paper was officially recommended in the Subgroup meeting and actions were assigned in the official minutes. In addition, all Services represented at the last QA Subgroup had endorsed the Navy's recommendation.

4/95 AMCCOM(QAM) -Stated the JOCG/QA Subgroup had met March 95. They decided to send out a letter to all Services requesting formal confirmation that they wanted the traceable seals. The letter would also request additional DODICs for application and any cost data that may be available in addition to that supplied by Crane or QAS. This concerned PM4A as a formal brief had been made to the JOCG/QA Subgroup and all Services agreed with

traceable seals issue and were tasked to identify the applicable DODICs. Now we are again going to ask if the Services agree.

7/95 Earle - Stated the Packaging and Handling Subgroup had addressed the sealing issue, but felt the Navy was the only Service that needed traceable seals on individual containers within wire bound boxes. Earle had contacted Engineering at AMCCOM who gave them another cost estimate.

7/95 NSWC CR (PM4A) - PM4A reiterated again that QA had already agreed these seals on containers within wire bound boxes would also help AMCCOM. QA would be the group actually inspecting the ammunition where the seals would be of value. In addition, all Services had agreed at a May 94 QA Subgroup meeting to implement these seals. An agreement at a Subgroup should have more meaning, and why was Engineering making the decision for AMCCOM as to whether an item needs to be sealed or not? We have a NOC message of 1994 requiring seals on this type ammunition and the group agreed to forward this action to them to write a letter to the AMCCOM CG to resolve it.

2/96 NSWC CR (PM4A) - Had discussed traceable seals with the new facilitator of the JOCG QA subgroup in Nov 95. The status of the issue was discussed at the NOV subgroup meeting even though PM4A did not attend. All Services had again confirmed acceptance on traceable seals on metal cans with the last, Marine Corps, concurrence received Sept 95. As discussed 4/95 the JOCG QA had send out a letter to all Services requesting formal confirmation that they wanted the traceable seals. QA had sent memo to Engineering (ESW-S) requesting TDP revision, memo to packaging authorizing ECPs to add seals on 5.56mm, 7.62mm and 50 cal only

ACTION # 83-194 (CONTINUED)

produced at Lake City AAP. The seal to take affect April 96 on FY 95 packages. They were to implement of other calibers based on success of the above 3. QA was to follow the effort but the minutes of the subgroup meeting in Nov 95 did not state they would follow it.

2/96 NWS Earle (5012) - Discussed a government symposium to take place 6 - 7 Feb 96. They were to discuss lead wire seal environmental issues and various seal issues. Earle would have someone attend and brief the PAT of the results at the next meeting. The JOCG Packaging & Handling Subgroup had still not met.

10/96 AMCCOM (IOE-A) - Submitted a paper stating the 11 September 96 JOCG QA meeting included comments on traceable seals. Mr R. Williams reported that "packout scheme using traceable seals

would begin 1 Oct 96 at Lake City AAP for 5.56mm, 7.62mm and 50 cal. IOE-I will monitor action taken on traceable seals and develop a plan for expanding its' use to other items already identified by the Services". PM4A stated he had the minutes to the meeting which also stated the JOCG QA would continue to monitor the expansion of using seals on small arms ammo and etc. 10/96 Earle(5012) - Handed out several pages extracted from the minutes of a Feb 96 government symposium in which they addressed the hazards of using lead seals. The take home message was "lead is a hot topic. EPA, CalEPA are very adamant, they are going to reduce exposure to lead. It is easy because they have wiped out lead in gasoline. Gasoline retailers once said the cars would fall apart if you take the lead out. Didn't happen. They removed it from paint. Paint manufacturers said paint wouldn't hold up. Didn't happen. They don't think you are going to have a very good push saying the security of our country will be in jeopardy if you eliminate lead seals. They have already gone through these other two folks. It's coming and its here". 3/97 Earle (5012) - Did not submit and ECP even though they did get one chopped by 402. ARDEC told Earle not to submit and ECP since it would not be approved. They have years of supply of lead seals. The SWG stated to submit one anyway to force to document their reasons not to get rid of lead in seals. 8/97 Earle (5012) - Provided the group a copy of the ECP they had sent ARDEC to take lead as a alternate off their drawing and stop using lead wire seals in new procurement. Also provided ARDEC'S response stating there were too many lead seals in the inventory to just stop using them and did not approve the ECP. ARDEC recommended an ECP be prepared to add a note on the drawing 8794342 banning new procurement or production of the lead seals but allowing depletion of stocks in the inventory. The tech agents of the SWG did not feel this was practical and the group decided to close this action since ARDEC would not budge on their position. The Navy in most cases already takes exception to the drawings not to allow lead wire seals on Navy new production.

**2E/2T ACQUISITION PROCUREMENT/PRODUCTION
PROCESS ACTION TEAM (PAT)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 84-494

REQ COMPLETION DATE:

ISSUE/PROBLEM: P-24 pricing sheets, which exhibit the breakdown on SMCA prices, are not returned to the Navy electronically with the rest of the Acquisition Plan (PP2 sheets).

STATUS: OPEN: MONITOR: CLOSED: XXX

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: Doug Morrell

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

4/94 AMCCOM (DS) - Investigate whether the P-24 pricing sheets/data is being sent to the Navy electronically along with the other PP2 data. If not how can it be.

4/94 IMSD - Review the process for updating the ammo procurement prices in the IMSD/CAIMS cataloging system. Identify solutions/actions necessary to assure current procurement prices for 2E/2T are reflected. (THIS ACTION WAS REFERRED TO 86-494)

6/94 NSWC (PM4) Verify that the P-24 pricing data for 2T ammunition is being sent to PM4 electronically.

10/94 AMCCOM (DS) - Verify Army involvement in the ABMS meetings. Is there still a need for ABMS?

1/95 AMCCOM (DS) - Action of 10/94 remains open.

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

4/94 PM4C - Submitted an issue paper stating P-24 pricing sheets, which exhibit the rationale for SMCA pricing of Service procurements, are returned under separate cover from the Acquisition Plan (PP2) which is automated under the Automated Budget Management System (ABMS). This creates unnecessary handling of paper and prevents pricing data from being incorporated into automated databases which can be referenced for various tracking and analytical efforts. Recommended the SMCA incorporate the data elements of the p-24 sheets into the database file created by the ABMS.

ACTION #84-494 (CONTINUED)

6/94 AMCCOM (DS) - Stated the P-24 sheets can be sent electronically to the Navy but it takes a long time to download the data at the receiving end. They thought that PM4F could already pull the data from the computer but was wanting it in ASCII format. Also stated the Marine Corps is currently getting the data through the ABMS system as raw database files. PM4/PM4A stated the Navy should be getting same raw data as they are on the same Joint Service ABMS Group. The Navy can put it in any form afterwards as we suspect the Marine Corps is doing.

10/94 NSWC (PM4A) - Stated PM4 can pull P-24 data electronically on a ASCII file only. A P-24 cannot be printed out yet, but it

was felt the file could be transferred to a DBASE file and then used/sorted appropriately to get P-24 data even though it may not look like a P-24. Hopefully the same program can be use each time to translate the data. The question is why is ABMS taking so long? PM4 understands AMCCOM is no longer participating in the ABMS reviews. Is ABMS even necessary today?

4/95 AMCCOM (DS) - Stated AMCCOM does not need ABMS and does not use it internally.

4/95 NSWC CR (PM4A) - Stated the Air Force, Navy and Army said at the April 95 JOCG ACQ Subgroup meeting, that ABMS is only used to pulled PP2 data electronically from AMCCOM. None of them use it to feed their procurement budget. The Navy already uses commercial off the shelf software (DBASE & EXCEL) to generate their budget. The PAT closed the action.

**2E/2T ACQUISITION PROCUREMENT/PRODUCTION
PROCESS ACTION TEAM (PAT)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 85-494	REQ COMPLETION DATE: JUN 94
-----------------------------------	------------------------------------

ISSUE/PROBLEM: "Final" Hazardous Classification is required by Transportation Regulations before an item can be shipped. Interim Classification is unacceptable.

STATUS:	OPEN:	MONITOR:	CLOSED: XXX
----------------	-------	----------	-------------

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: JACK PUCKETT
CARL LOUCK

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

4/94 NSWC Crane (402) - Review all 2T and 2E Pyro undelivered orders and identify which items do not have "final" hazardous classification defined on them. Include test vehicles.

4/94 PMTC - Review PMTC assigned 2E cog, undelivered orders and identify which items do not have "final" hazardous classification defined on them. Include test vehicles.

4/94 AMCCOM (PDM) - Quantify the hazardous classification problem within the SMCA (include Army developed items). If a problem truly exists identify proposed solutions.

4/94 IMSCD - Review the Navy cataloging process and identify how to get "final" hazardous classification on a non-stock numbered item.

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

4/94 AMCCOM (PDM) - Discussed a problem with the current Transportation Reg that required "final" hazardous classification on ammo items before they could be shipped. Interim classification was no longer acceptable. This includes components especially non-stock numbered items. The PAT members felt stock numbered items may not be a problem but no one was sure. PDM stated that certain shipments had been stopped because of this Regulation.

6/94 NSWC Crane (402) - Briefed the group on the process they used to review 2T items to see which items do not have final hazardous classification. Reviewed all items and their hazardous components with undelivered MIPRs including FMS (54 items total).

Only 9 did not have final hazard classification.
All 9 are in process to get final hazard classification.

6/94 AMCCOM (PDM) - Hazard classification within the Navy does not appear to be a problem as it is in the Army. In discussions

ACTION #85-494 (CONTINUED)

with the Navy (IH, PMTC, Crane 402), the only problem encountered was on Army developed M6 propellant which has since been fixed. Recommended to close this action. The PAT group agreed to close the action.

2E/2T ACQUISITION PROCUREMENT/PRODUCTION
PROCESS ACTION TEAM (PAT)

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 86-494 REQ COMPLETION DATE: NOV 95

ISSUE/PROBLEM: Lack of Understanding the CAIMS Cataloging

Process, getting Stock Numbers Assigned & the Accuracy of
Procurement Prices in the Catalog

STATUS: OPEN: MONITOR: CLOSED: XXX

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: DOUG MORRELL

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

4/94 IMSD - Set up a brief for the next meeting to explain the process/timing to get a stock numbers assigned and how/when all cataloging data in CAIMS is updated e.g. procurement price.

Address the variations in the process of getting a stock number assigned e.g. for complete new item, old item with different packaging and an item used by another Service.

6/94 AMCCOM (PDM) - Identify how and when the FY 95 procurement prices/fixed std prices will be submitted by the SMCA to DLSC. In addition, identify the SMCA rules as to when a price in the catalog needs to be updated e.g. after 2 years of continuous procurement or etc.

6/94 IMSD - Identify how often CAIMS catalog prices are updated/pulled from DLSC.

10/94 AMCCOM (PDM) - Investigate how procurement prices for the cataloging can be put into AMDF (Army Master Data File) when they are not currently being procured (not on the P-forms).

1/95 AMCCOM (PDM) - Action of 10/94 remains open. In addition, for currently procured items, identify if the prices being entered into AMDF can always reflect a unit cost with no GFM. What needs to be done to formalize this policy?

4/95 AMCCOM (DS) - Investigate how procurement prices for the cataloging can be put into AMDF (Army Master Data File) when they are not currently being procured (not on the P-forms). In addition, how and when could the Navy provide the data to AMCCOM?

7/95 AMCCOM (DS) - Action of 4/95 remains open.

ACTION # 86-494 (CONTINUED)

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

4/94 PMTC - Discussed the confusion the TDP Quality Working Group had in trying to understand how stock numbers were assigned and how cataloging data got updated in CAIMS.

4/94 NSWC (PM4) - stated the QMB (IMSD) rep had an action to review the current time it took to get a new stock number assigned. It was apparently taking up to 9 months due to other activities besides IMSD e.g. I.H and Dahl having to review the requests for safety and HERO, respectively.

6/94 IMSD - Briefed the group on the stock number assignment process. The current process is under review to shorten the time involved. The proposed changes are: PM/ISEAs submit cataloging request forms w/required tech data to IMSD (8522). IMSD initiates NSN request to DLSC for NSN assignment. Upon receipt of NSN IMSD will simultaneously send cataloging request form along with NSN to IH (041), NOC (N424) and Earle (503). The Activities will complete their portion of the form and send it back to the IMSD with safety, transportation and packaging data.

Then the IMSD will enter the data and activate the NSN in CAIMS. Catalog pricing data/processes were also discussed. The system appears to be working on current SMCA procured items since the SMCA provides the latest prices to DLSC which is where CAIMS gets most of its data. When older items, not in procurement, need a more current price in CAIMS, e.g. for FMS cases, the PM can write to the IMSD who will enter a better price in CAIMS.

10/94 AMCCOM (PDM) - Provided a discussion paper on how PRIME (CAWCF) pricing data gets feed to AMDF (Army master data file) which eventually feeds DLSC which eventually feeds CAIMS. The transfer of PRIME budget year end item and component prices to the NSNMDR for update of the AMDF was utilized for the first time in Aug 92. The program was developed by the Systems Analysis Office to pull the unit price info from P-forms for a specified budget cycle set up in the pricing analysis' subdirectories and allows for a program-to-program transfer of info to eliminate manual errors/input. The program is used annually to update AMDF after the lock of the President's budget. The price reflects the last buy price and not the selling price. For example; price = last buy price with or with out GFM, Price = execution FY price off of the P-forms.

10/94 IMSD - Stated CAIMS pulls cataloging/pricing data from DLSC in early May each year.

ACTION #86-494 (CONTINUED)

1/95 NWAC (P2603A) - Provided data in which they had checked the CAIMS unit cost against their current unit cost of about 20 bomb/bomb components. Some of the current unit prices were estimated by NWAC based on prices of similar NSNs, while others

were off the MIPR. The CAIMS price was in most cases considerably lower than their current unit price. It still appears the process is broke somewhere.

4/95 NSWC (PM4) - Reiterated the need for CAIMS pricing data to be accurate. A lot of open discussion/debate took place again.

2/96 IOC (SMA-D) - Provided a brief paper referencing a meeting between IOC reps and PM4A & PM4C of 30 Nov 95. The value of the prices loaded in the AMDF file in the CCSS system had been discussed. Based on Chief Financial Officers Act of 1990 (public law 101-576), and the 12 Jan 94 DOD guidance on form and content requirements, the financial statement presentations will value inventory items at the latest acquisition cost. Since this statement is pulled from CCSS the prices must reflect the last purchase price of the item. All agreed to close this action.

**2E/2T ACQUISITION PROCUREMENT/PRODUCTION
PROCESS ACTION TEAM (PAT)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 88-694 **REQ COMPLETION DATE:** NOV 95

ISSUE/PROBLEM: Time/Days Required for Actual Testing, Exceeds

the Test Time allowed in the Contract. Believed to be due to Excessive Testing Requirements.

STATUS: OPEN: MONITOR: CLOSED: XXX

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: GERALD LOWRY

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

6/94 NSWC (402) - Review 2T test cost requirements with the specific intent to reduce the actual testing time. Report results at the next PAT meeting with any recommended further action by the PAT.

10/94 AMCCOM (QAM) - Identify 3 2E items and 3 2T items where actual testing time has exceeded the test time allowed in contract. Identify the primary cause for each as recommended in the action taken of 10/94 by 402.

1/95 AMCCOM (QAM) - Action of 10/94 remains open.

4/95 AMCCOM (QAM) - Action of 10/94 remains open.

7/95 AMCCOM (QAM) - Action of 10/94 remains open.

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

6/94 NSWC (4025) - Submitted this issue based on QAM viewgraphs of 6/96 showing for many items the actual testing time exceeded the contract allowable time for the government (usually 45 days). There are 3 solutions to this problem; PDM will send a letter to the test activities prioritizing their work (addressed in action #35-491), change the time for testing to a larger number of days e.g. 60(also addressed in action #35-491) or reduce mandatory test time requirements which appears to have been overlooked.

10/94 NSWC Crane (402) - Recommended that QAM identify the worst offenders (DODICs where actual testing time exceeds test time allowed in contract); test activity identify for each offender the cause (equip, personnel, procedures, scheduling, test requirement); if test requirement is identified as principal cause AEA & DA will review requirement; if test requirement cannot be modified, test time allowance should be increased; and on a continuing basis, AEA & DA will include testing time as a design review parameter.

2/96 All - After reviewing the action taken 10/94 and not seeing any future benefit of more PAT action on this issue, the PAT agreed to close this action.

**2E/2T ACQUISITION PROCUREMENT/PRODUCTION
PROCESS ACTION TEAM (PAT)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 91-1094 **REQ COMPLETION DATE:** 1 OCT 95

ISSUE/PROBLEM: Hard Copies of ALN Data Cards are not being sent to NSWC Crane (402), per the CDRLS, for Technical Verification of Accuracy before being put into ALRAMS by AMCCOM.

STATUS: OPEN: MONITOR: CLOSED: XXX

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: BOB VAN HYFTE

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

10/94 AMCCOM(QAM) - Assure CDRL requirements directing a hard copy of lot data cards be provided to Crane code 402 are included in the contract.

1/95 AMCCOM (QAM) - Assure CDRL requirements directing a hard copy of lot data cards be provided to Crane code 402 are included in the contract. In addition, define how QA controls the data integrity of what gets into ALRAMS, who actually enters the data and by what direction do they change it, if found wrong?

4/95 AMCCOM (QAM) - Institute a control process over ALRAMS to control who is authorized to actually change a data card once entered into ALRAMS. Suggest start with a list of authorized POCs at each Service Technical Agent for their cog items. Brief the decision/process at the next PAT meeting.

7/95 AMCCOM (QAM) - Action of 4/95 remains open.

7/95 NSWC CR (4027) - Prepare and issue paper requesting clarification of how AMCCOM defines PD/QA deliverables in the AMCCOM contract/etc with GOGOs and GOCOs. Submit issue paper to PM4A by 1 Oct who will coordinate with AMCCOM to have the subject briefed at the next PAT meeting.

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

ACTION #91-1094 (CONTINUED)

10/94 NSWC Crane (PM4A) - Provided a point paper sighting examples where CDRL requirements for sending a hard copy of ammo

lot data cards to Crane 402 was not being put in all the contracts out of AMCCOM. Getting these data cards had been worked out with AMCCOM (QA and etc) when ALRAMS was accepted as the data card repository for all Services. The Navy has continually found errors in contractor generated data cards and the Navy technical activity reviewing the cards before they are entered into ALRAMS was the best way to fix the accuracy of ALRAMS. Per QAD, they have no technical ability to verify the accuracy of data cards before they are entered. The cards are just dumped into ALRAMS with only a few computer checks on lot sequencing and etc.

4/95 AMCCOM (QAM) - Sampled several contracts, the requirements to send hard copies to Crane 402 is being put in and is still the AMCCOM policy. QAD stated the discs which are sent to AMCCOM and entered into ALRAMS are only edited when the computer check notes an error. The computer only checks certain things and no one verifies cards are missing or even sent from the producer. Errors noted by the tech agent, Crane 402, are identified to contractor to change the data card. No control exists over who can change the data card database in ALRAMS.

7/95 NSWC CR (4027) - Stated they had taken a sample of 12 pyro/demo data cards to see if hard copies of the data cards are in fact being sent to 4027 for review by AMCCOM. Two of 12 were not sent and it had not been a CDRL on the contract to send them. They believe these 2 to be an unusual case after talking to AMCCOM.

2/96 NSWC CR (PM4A / 4027) - Stated 4027 had written an issue paper, October 95, per the 7/95 action. The issue was the need to clarify how the IOC defines production and QA deliverables in the contract or etc with GOGOs and GOCOs. The issue paper had been sent to the IOC by PM4A prior to the 2/96 meeting.

2/96 IOC (IOE-A) - Briefed the group on how the IOC defines production & QA deliverables in the IOC contract & etc with GOGOs and GOCOs. This action was closed by the PAT, but part of it was included in a new action #97-296.

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 92-1094

REQ COMPLETION DATE: NOV 95

ISSUE/PROBLEM: Lack of Understanding what Management Information AMCCOM has Computerized and Available to the Navy. (e.g. solicitations, contract award date, test data, pricing and etc)

STATUS: OPEN: MONITOR: CLOSED: XXX

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: JOHN ABBOTT
MARK EMBREE

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

10/94 AMCCOM (PDM) - Provide a listing of automated information systems and the data they contain to PM4C/NVLNO. Set up an in house demonstration of the information systems for PM4/NVLNO.

10/94 NSWC Crane (PM4C)- Coordinate with Crane 402 and NAWC to define how they might get access to any necessary data systems demonstrated in PDM action of 10/94.

1/95 AMCCOM (PDM)/ NSWC CR (PM4C) - Both actions of 10/94 remain open.

4/95 AMCCOM (PDM)/ NSWC CR (PM4C) - Both actions of 10/94 remain open. Due Nov 95.

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

10/94 NSWC Crane (PM4C) - Provided a point paper stating what the 2T community had done to automate management information and make it readily available to any user. This includes data pertinent to pricing, planning, MIPRs, configuration management, data cards, documentation, status accounting and etc. In order to expand the usefulness of the 2T system additional data is needed and preferred in electronic format, e.g. solicitations, contract award dates, contract management data and QA and test data. If data like this is available in electronic format it would save a lot of time and phone calls to get it. Recommended the PAT investigate how the above data is maintained at AMCCOM, and in what automated format(s) it resides. Additionally, determine what steps need to be taken to allow this information to be electronically transferred to the Navy for incorporation into its

ACTION #92-1094 (CONTINUED)

management information systems.

4/95 AMCCOM (PDM) - Suggested we close this action for now based

on all the CAWCF/ADP changes going on. AMCCOM is also in too much turmoil with their reorganization. All agreed to close until Oct 95.

2/96 NSWC CR (PM4A/C) - Stated they had visited the IOC Nov 95 to understand the various IOC data systems. Areas discussed pertaining to the PAT are; CCSS = system that feeds CAIMS, the primary inventory system, the primary system used by production, includes form 45s, AMDF and planning prons. Form 38s are manual by SMA-D using the 45s as input. PRIME = separate system from CCSS which includes CAWCF data, ABMS, and all P forms. Our PP 2s use the ABMS software to send them to the IOC who downloads them to DSACS which loads them into PRIME. The PRIME also generates the ICAPP. The inventory systems include CCSS(command commodity std system) which has no ALN date, is feed by their SDS (std depot systems)conus and the SAAS, oconus. WARS is not a system but a quarterly report showing Army inventory data only which is extracted from CCSS and SDS. A few DSACs modules are still used by QA. DSACs has unique ALN data for CONUS only which is pulled from SDS. Overall there is not much ready access for the Navy into these various IOC systems, except into some parts of PRIME. The PAT agreed to close this action.

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 95-195

REQ COMPLETION DATE: NOV 95

ISSUE/PROBLEM: The NWAD Gage Master File is not Automated for Easier Access

STATUS: OPEN: MONITOR: CLOSED: XXX

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: JOHN GARRIOT

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

1/95 NWAD (MS-16) - Automate the NWAD Gage Master File for access by both internal NWAD and external 2T/2E users. Report status at next meeting.

4/95 NWAD (MS-16) - Action of 1/95 remains open. Use FOXPROW software.

7/95 NWAD (MS-16) - Action of 1/95 remains open.

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

1/95 NSWC CR (4025) - Brought up the issue that the NWAD Gage Master File is currently not being distributed and should be automated for easier access.

4/95 NWAD (MS-16) - Has started putting the Gage Master File in Microsoft Access but is having trouble. PM4A asked if it could be put in FOXPROW instead as this is more readily used by the 2T community. NWAD agreed. Suggested NWAD call Crane 402 ADP POC and to get a copy of FOXPROW quickly.

7/95 NWAD (MS-16) - Has acquired FOXPROW software and is training on it. They are currently working with Crane 4025 to define exactly what data fields are needed in the Gage Master File. Should be able to close this action after the next meeting.

2/96 NWAD (MS-16) - Stated they will be done automating the gage master file in April 96. It will be released in April on a 3 1/2 floppy and they will update it every 6 months. The PAT agreed to close this action.

**2E/2T ACQUISITION PROCUREMENT/PRODUCTION
PROCESS ACTION TEAM (PAT)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 96-195

REQ COMPLETION DATE: JUL 95

ISSUE/PROBLEM: There is no Standardized 2T/2E Approach on Transitioning from Level III TPDs to Performance Specs when Applicable, per the OSD Acquisition Reform memo of 29 June 94.

STATUS: OPEN: MONITOR: CLOSED: XXX

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: Carl Louck

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

1/95 NSWC CR (402) - Chair a working group to attempt to standardize the 2T/2E approach on transitioning from Level III TPDs to Performance Specs when applicable. When do we make the decision and how do we do it. Initially, be sure to define how we will address tiering of Mil-Specs/Std. Participants should be PM4, and NAWC.

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

1/95 - The PAT debated over the Specs & Std. issue, when to use performance specs (reprocurements when it make sense, PIPs etc), how to deal with tiering of specs. The group decided to set up a working group to try to standardize transitioning from Level III TPDs to Perf Specs when applicable per the OSD 29 June 94 memo. They also wanted tiering standardized between 2T/2E quickly because the FY 96 PDPs were due in March 95.

4/95 NSWC Crane (4025) - Briefed the group on the outcome of the working group meeting between NAWC and Crane (PM4, 402) at Crane, 23 March 95. The decisions made were; (a) Reprocurements: use performance specs only where very obvious cost or other benefits, otherwise business as usual. (b) PIPS: those resulting in new NSNs we should be prepared to justify not using performance specs. Other PIPS are same as reprocurements. (c) RDT&E: performances specs are required or a require formal waiver. (d) Tiering: necessary tier II and III documents will be listed in the ADL with the tier I documents. Contractor will be advised during pre-awards and post awards conference of these documents.

The last action was to verify with AMCCOM that the documents listed on the ADLs are tier I documents (i.e. that ADLs are tier 0). AMCCOM (PC/QAD) stated all specs listed on the ADL will be contractually binding.

ACTION #96-195 (CONTINUED)

4/95 NWAC (P2603A) - Passed out a draft DON letter of 23 March 95 on tiering of specs and stds. It states for reprocurements, conformance with the DOD tiering requirements is encouraged but not required. There was a lot of discussion because the 2T community was applying the tiering approach stated above in 4/95 Crane 402 action taken while the 2E community did not feel they now needed to because of this new draft DON memo. This memo had not been available at the 23 march 95 working group meeting at Crane.

4/95 AMCCOM (QAD/PC) - Stated all specs listed on the ADL will be contractually binding. They do not intent to change their current process for FY 96 reprocurements and the IOC implementation plan for Specs and Std's does not specifically address tiering level. QAD/PM4A Also talked to ARDEC by phone on 4/12/95, and they are doing similar to AMCCOM.

7/95 NAWC (110000E) - Stated SECNAV memo 95-3 had been signed. It exempts the Navy, on reprocurements, from conforming to the DOD tiering requirements in the SecDef memo of 29 June 94? An official MAP is to be created for 2E commodities which includes a strategic plan for systematic implementation of specs and stds reform. This plan should be provided at the next PAT meeting.

7/95 NSWCR (PM4) - Stated the 2T community is still going to move all necessary 2nd and 3rd tier specs and stds up to the ADL to make them mandatory in the contract. Most are bought through the SMCA. The Army philosophy is different than the Navy's on tiering. Although they have said they will not apply their rules to our packages, historically this has not always proven to be the case. All agreed to close this action but to continue to have NAWC, in action 93, monitor the specs and stds reform process.

**2E/2T ACQUISITION STANDING WORKING GROUP
(SWG)**

ACTION ITEM NUMBER: 98-296 **REQ COMPLETION DATE:** NOV 96

ISSUE/PROBLEM: Navy needs a routine copy of the IOC Pron to MIPR Cross Reference Listing.

STATUS: OPEN: MONITOR: CLOSED: XXX

ACTION ASSIGNED TO: Bobbie Russell

REQUIREMENT/ACTION:

2/96 IOC (SMA-DB) - Investigate how the Navy (NWAC 110000E & CRANE 402) can get on routine distribution of the IOC Pron vs MIPR cross reference listing.

6/96 IOC (SMA-DB) - Action of 2/96 remains open.

NARRATIVE OF ACTION TAKEN:

2/96 CR (4025) - Submitted and issue paper to have the IOC investigate how Crane 402 could be put on routine distribution of the IOC Pron vs MIPR cross reference listing. It had been occasionally provided by the NVLNO in the distant past and had proven to be useful. The listing had apparently come from a "cost control system for conventional ammo" within the IOC.

10/96 IOC (SMA-Y) - Stated they were now providing the IOC Pron vs MIPR cross reference listing to the NVLNO. Who was now providing it to whomever needed it. PM4A stated they had provided it to 402 as they had asked PM4 who needed it. All agreed to close this action.

